THE CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW

New Series, Vol. VIII JANUARY, 1929 No. 4

PUBLISHED BY
THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA
AT LYNCHBURG, VA., AND WASHINGTON, D. C.

BOOK REVIEWS

PAGE

PAETOW—*The Crusades and Other Historical Essays*, by Hewitt B. Vinnedge 608

FRENCH—*The Taking of Ticonderoga in 1775: the British Story*, by Richard J. Purcell, Ph.D. 610

Massachusetts Historical Society, Proceedings, by Richard J. Purcell, Ph.D. 611

GAUGHAN—*The Story of Sir Charles Vereker*, by J. F. L. 613

DONNELLY—*Literary Art and Education*, by J. F. L. 613

SCOTT—*Issac Jogues, Missioner and Martyr*, by J. F. L. 614

MUNDELEIN—*Letters of a Bishop to His Flock*, by J. F. L. 614

LAWLER—*Builders of America*, by J. F. L. 615

STANISLAUS—*The Journeys of Jesus*, by S. J. F. 615

ERLE—*St. Francis Xavier, the Apostle of India and Japan*, by S. J. F. 616

WINDLE—*Religions Past and Present*, by S. J. F. 616

BOARD OF EDITORS

Editor-in-Chief

RIGHT REV. THOMAS J. SHAHAN, D.D.

Managing Editor

REV. PATRICK W. BROWNE, D.D., Ph.D.

Associate Editors

VERY REV. PATRICK J. HEALY, D.D., Chairman
REV. VICTOR O'DANIEL, O.P., S.T.M.
CHARLES HALLAN MCCARTHY, Ph.D.
REV. GEORGE BONIFACE STRATEMEIER, O.P., Ph.D.
REV. PETER GUILDAY, Ph.D.
LEO F. STOCK, Ph.D.
RICHARD J. PURCELL, Ph.D.
J. DE SIQUEIRA COUTINHO, C.E., SC.D.
PAUL G. GLEIS, Ph.D.

Published at 816 Main St., Lynchburg, Va., by the Catholic University of America, of Washington, D. C.

Correspondence in regard to subscriptions may be sent either to 816 Main St., Lynchburg, Va., or to the Managing Editor, Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C. All correspondence in regard to contributions should be sent to the latter address.

The
Catholic Historical Review

NEW SERIES, VOLUME VIII JANUARY, 1929 NUMBER 4

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

Though one of the youngest educational establishments for higher learning in the United States, the Catholic University of America has achieved wondrous results in the academic field. From humble beginnings the Institution has grown immensely and it is now recognized as the center of Catholic life in America. In the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore, October, 1866, the Bishops of the United States expressed their desire for the establishment of a university; and the project took definite shape in the Third Plenary Council (1884) which included in its "Acta et Decreta" the decision to establish such an institution. The Right Rev. John J. Keane, then Bishop of Richmond, was appointed rector. Pope Leo XIII, in 1887, sanctioned the undertaking and by the Apostolic Letter "Magni Nobis Gaudii" (7 March, 1889) approved the Constitution and the Statutes, and empowered the University Ispant the usual degrees. The scope of the University as defined by Leo XIII was "to provide instruction in every department of learning to the end that the clergy and laity alike might have an opportunity to satisfy fully their laudable desire for knowledge." The Pope furthermore urged that the seminaries, colleges, and other Catholic Institutions of learning should be affiliated to the University. The Institution has nobly carried out the wishes of the Pope; and as it stands today, the University is an embodiment of the papal idea. Beginning with a few students and a small professorial staff, with a single building, it now numbers thousands in its student body, has large and efficient professorial faculties and a group of buildings reflecting the advancement made during its brief career. In 1896, Bishop Keane was succeeded in the rectorship by the Rev. Thomas J. Conaty of Wor-

cester, Massachusetts, who became (1903) Bishop of Los Angeles. His successor was the Right Rev. Denis J. O'Connell, appointed (1907) Bishop of Sebaste, to whom succeeded Right Rev. Thomas J. Shahan Bishop of Germanicopolis (1909). Under Bishop Shahan's progressive and prudent administration the University made rapid advancement. After three arduous terms as rector, he declined re-appointment. A volume were needed to record the achievements of Bishop Shahan. Perhaps the most prominent characteristic of this scholarly prelate has been the inspirational influence of his personality. In his retirement it must be consoling to him to realize that apart from the material development of the University, there remains amongst both professors and students a feeling of deepest affection and veneration. Happily the ties which bound him during a lengthy academic and directional career have not been entirely severed. As *rector emeritus* and director of the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception he retains a conpact which we hope will long endure. The installation of his successor Right Rev. Monsignor James H. Ryan doubtless revived in him many happy thoughts and deposited on the silent shores of memory hallowed recollections which time cannot efface. The Letter of Pius XI to the American Hierarchy (which follows) should be a source of consolation to Bishop Shahan, whose labors are praised by the Supreme Pontiff, and of encouragement to Monsignor Ryan and his associates.

LETTER OF HIS HOLINESS, POPE PIUS XI.

TO OUR BELOVED SONS

WILLIAM O'CONNELL, Cardinal Priest of the Title of St. Clement, Archbishop of Boston,

DENNIS DOUGHERTY, Cardinal Priest of the Title of Sts. Nereus and Achilles, Archbishop of Philadelphia,

GEORGE MUNDELEIN, Cardinal Priest of the Title of Sta. Maria del Popolo, Archbishop of Chicago,

PATRICK J. HAYES, Cardinal Priest of the Title of Sta. Maria in Via, Archbishop of New York,

AND TO OUR OTHER VENERABLE BROTHERS, THE ARCHBISHOPS AND BISHOPS OF THE UNITED STATES,

PIUS XI, POPE

Beloved Sons and Venerable Brothers, greeting and Apostolic blessing.

Since it is a matter of greatest concern to Us that your undertakings and above all your endeavors in behalf of the Christian education of youth should succeed as you desire, We rejoice heartily in the growth of your Catholic schools, seminaries and colleges. In particular, We are glad to note the progress which, under your direction, has been made by the Catholic University in Washington, because the more it prospers the more vigorous and efficient will be your other educational institutions.

That the progress of the University is largely due to the efforts of our Venerable Brother, Thomas Shahan, Titular Bishop of Germanicopolis, and Rector Emeritus of the University, you are well aware: this indeed is acknowledged by all who are interested in having religion upheld and furthered through the concordant testimony of revelation and reason. Therefore, as he of his own accord has retired from office after three terms of excellent service, We have taken great pleasure in bestowing upon him the praise which he so well deserves and in appointing him Assistant to our Pontifical Throne.

So it came about that, as the vacancy had to be filled by the appointment of another Rector Magnificus, We, acting upon the advice of the Sacred Congregation of Seminaries and Universities, recently appointed our beloved son, JAMES RYAN, Roman Prelate, whom you also approved, to the Rectorship of the Catholic University in Washington. And it is Our earnest hope that he, under your leadership and guidance, will be able to carry this great work, day by day, to higher stages of development.

At the same time We profit by this excellent opportunity to recall certain facts which express succinctly the thought and the will of the Apostolic See regarding your University, its founding and upbuilding. Thus from the very beginning, our predecessor, Leo XIII, at the instance of the Fathers of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, deemed worthy of all

praise the project formed by them of establishing a university. Now, since the reasons for which the Bishops then claimed that the University was absolutely necessary, have become in the course of time ever more serious, it is no wonder that our predecessors of happy memory, Pius X and Benedict XV, fostered the growing institution with special care and solicitude and encouraged the Bishops by praising them for the fine work which already has been accomplished. Hence also, upon the petition of the Bishops, it was decreed that the University in Washington should forever remain under the control and protection of the Episcopate of your country; that no move should be made toward the establishment of another university in the United States of North America until all the usual faculties had been organized in the University at Washington; and finally that for the support of this University a yearly collection should be taken up in every diocese. Add to this the fact that the Constitution of the University which recently, after consultation with all the Bishops, has been revised, lays down, among other provisions relative to the development of the University, that "all who are engaged in the government and administration of the University, shall take the deepest concern in fostering, more and more actively, its development." This provision is in thorough agreement with what Leo XIII wrote to His Eminence James Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore (10 April, 1887) and subsequently to all the Bishops of your country (7 March, 1889): "Since this great University is designed not only to enhance the glory of your Country but also to bear wholesome and abundant fruit through the spreading of sound doctrine and the nourishing of Catholic piety, We rightfully expect that the faithful in America, magnanimous as they are, will not fail you when they are called on to give generous support for the completion on a splendid scale of the work you have undertaken."

Such solicitude on the part of the Roman Pontiff aroused the hope, by no means faint, that your University was entering upon the road of prosperity—a hope which was cherished not only by Catholics but by all who were aware of the fact that the Church, throughout the ages, had been the mother and nurse of universities and similar centers of higher learning.

Wherefore, as you yourselves, Beloved Sons and Brothers, fully understand, it would bring discredit on the Church if your University did not attain the degree of perfection which it needs in order to realize its aim: all the more so because in your country there are so many universities richly endowed and supported by non-Catholics, through the generosity either of private individuals or of associations.

Let not the fact be overlooked that during the past forty years, your University has been the source of great and various benefits—to your diocese and your schools, to the religious orders, to your clergy and your laity. Hence you can easily infer how many more and how much greater benefits would be derived from it if it were provided with all the means which it ought to have in abundance for the achievement of its purpose.

As to the faithful, there can be no doubt but that in this matter of the University, as in everything else which involves the welfare of religion, they will gladly follow the lead of their pastors. Only one thing is required—the people must be taught that the University at Washington is intended to educate both the cleric and the laymen, to equip them with higher learning in such wise that they not only will be thoroughly fitted, should occasion arise, to serve as teachers of the pupils in Catholic schools but also that they may be trained in such knowledge of Christian truth as will enable them to champion, vigorously, the rights of the Church and to win both for themselves and for the Catholic cause the respect of those who are outside the fold.

Do not for a moment imagine, Beloved Sons and Venerable Brothers, that you can keep your Catholic students from attending non-Catholic institutions of learning unless your own University be so organized as regards the number of its faculties and the ability of its professors, that it can compare favorably and compete successfully with those others to which We have just referred.

Therefore, to make a success of this most holy work, it is evidently necessary to gather, by annual collection, a large amount of money. The task of getting these funds, you must not leave to the Trustees, and much less to the Rector: you must take it upon yourselves and perform it with the aid of

your clergy. For you must be thoroughly convinced that whatever goes to the upbuilding of the University is not taken away from your dioceses or parishes: on the contrary, the money which they contribute will come back to them enhanced with a spiritual interest that will be to the great advantage of clergy and people alike.

This very point We put before you at the beginning of our Pontificate when We wrote: "If, as must needs be, the government and administration of the University is entrusted to a few of the Bishops, all should nevertheless have at heart its development, since it was established for the benefit of all the dioceses of America."

In this connexion, We think that it would be of the highest utility to the University if some Sunday, one and the same for all America, were set apart to be known as "Catholic University Day." On that day let the clergy in all your churches explain the scope and needs of the University, urge the faithful to contribute to the utmost of their ability and see to it that the collection is taken up in such manner as the Bishop may determine.

This does not mean that the question of aiding the University is to be dropped for the rest of the year. What, after all, is to hinder the formation in each diocese and in each parish of groups with a membership of priests and lay people who would be willing, as far as their means permit, to make regular donations of specific sums to the University—the groups to be classified according to the annual amount which the members agree and promise to contribute?

In this concerted action, let care be taken to give the children their place and share. For they with their tender hearts, ready as a rule to join in every noble enterprise, can easily be brought, under the guidance and persuasion of their parents, to love the University, the greatest of your institutions, once they realize that it is, now and always, the bulwark of their religion and of their country. And loving it they will vie with one another in giving their mite to help it. For it is quite natural that from childhood onward they should aid the University from which, in their later years, they will seek wisdom and all things else that go to the adornment of life.

Such, then, Beloved Sons and Venerable Brothers, are the measures which We, in keeping with our apostolic office and our fatherly solicitude, have decided to lay before you in behalf of your University at Washington—though it was hardly necessary that We should instruct you on these points, seeing that in such matters also, that is in promoting worthy causes by the collection of funds, you hold by far the highest level of success.

By carrying our directions into effect, you will place at the new Rector's disposal the means which are needed to build up the departments of the University and increase the facilities for study, thus enabling him to administer his office with more abundant results.

You will also do Us a most acceptable service by giving Us prompt and accurate information regarding whatever, in the judgment of each of you, may further or hinder the progress of your great University, so that, as occasion requires, We may intervene and use our authority to good effect.

Meantime as a harbinger of heavenly gifts and likewise as a token of our fatherly good-will toward you, We most lovingly in the Lord bestow Our Apostolic Blessing upon you, Beloved Sons and Venerable Brothers, upon the clergy and the people under your watchful care, and upon all who in any way may assist the University.

Given at St. Peter's, Rome, the tenth day of October in the year MCMXXVIII, the seventh of Our Pontificate.

PIUS XI POPE.

LETTER OF THE HOLY FATHER TO THE RECTOR OF THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

No. 73402 THE VATICAN, 7 September, 1928.

Right Honorable Sir,

The reverent homage which you pay the Holy Father in entering upon such an important office as that which, in consideration of your previous merits, has just been entrusted to you, with full confidence, by the Holy See, affords a sure foundation for that confidence, so much the surer as your realization

of your need of God's assistance is deeper and the attachment you show to this Chair of Truth is stronger.

Accordingly, the August Pontiff thanks you from his heart for this manifestation, so fervid and spontaneous, of your devotion to him. And since he has no doubt that, under your enlightened direction, the Catholic University will go forward on new lines of progress, he again expresses, in regard to the University itself and its providential mission among the people of your splendid country, his most earnest wishes for a manifold and fruitful activity. In token of his especial good-will, he bestows upon you, upon each member of the teaching staff and likewise upon the students of the University his heartening Apostolic blessing.

With my personal congratulations and with sentiments of highest esteem, I remain, honored Sir,

Devotedly yours,

P. CARD. GASPARRI.

To the Right Honorable
and Right Reverend
MONSIGNOR JAMES H. RYAN,
Rector of the Catholic University,
Washington, D. C.

THE ADOPTION OF THE ROMAN EASTER CALCULATION BY THE ISLAND CELTS[1]

INTRODUCTION

I. The Island Celts. By Island Celts we understand those Celts that were living in the British Isles, in opposition to the continental Celts in France, Spain, etc., who by this time were completely Romanized and had also received among themselves a sprinkling of Germans. All Britain was originally inhabited by various races of Celts. The inroads of the Angles, Saxons, and Jutes during the fifth century, however, confined the Celtic inhabitants of present England to the western peninsulas of Cornwall, Wales, and Strathclyde. Here alone they preserved their identity and also some civic organization. Though they were Christians they stubbornly refused to do anything for the conversion of their foes, and did not even recognize the converted Saxons as real Christians.

Almost at the same time, when the Anglo-Saxons were devastating Britain and destroying Christianity within their reach, the neighboring island, so far still practically pagan, became Christian through the apostolic labors of St. Patrick and his disciples and successors. This work of Christianization began in 432, and was practically finished by the end of the century.

Irish settlers—the name of the Irish in those times was Scots—emigrated to the shores of the northern part of Britain. They founded there a primitive political organization, the Kingdom of Dalriada, which eventually became the forerunner of the present Kingdom of Scotland. The names of Scots and Scotland itself came with these immigrants, who brought them from Ireland. Some centuries later they had ceased to be a designation for the Irish and their land, and were applied only to the northern part of Britain.

At the time of which we speak there existed east of the commonwealth of the Irish settlers the kingdom of the Picts, once the dreaded foes of the Britons, but since the establishment of the Anglo-Saxon Heptarchy on the defensive against the neighboring realm of Northumbria.

1 Paper read at the Convention of the Jesuit Historical Association, August, 1928.

It need not be repeated here that Ireland, once converted, sent many missionaries into other lands, where they strengthened the cause of religion or even began the Christianization of some regions. The conversion of the northern kingdoms of Britain, in particular that of the Picts, had been begun by St. Ninian, a native of Strathclyde. But the Irish became the real Apostles of that country. Numerous monks found their way to its shores. St. Columbkil eventually became the organizer of these missionary efforts. In 564 he established the great monastery of *Hii*, or *Iona* (Plummer, II,[2] p. 131.), which was destined to be the center of these apostolic labors, and the ecclesiastical capital of Scotland. Its abbot himself was never a bishop, Episcopal functions were performed by several of his subjects who had received episcopal consecration. He exercised ecclesiastical jurisdiction over the whole country. A number of abbeys in the opposite parts of Ireland, too, were under his way.

Iona sent missionaries into the neighboring kingdom of the Picts, and as far as we can see brought about its final conversion. Under the leadership of St. Aidan monks from Iona went into Northumbria, where they founded the monastery of Lindisfarne as their headquarters, and, though not the only missionaries in that field, exercised a paramount influence upon its complete conversion. Lindisfarne founded other monasteries in Northumbria, peopled by Irish and Anglo-Saxon monks, and on many occasions extended its influence into other kingdoms of the Heptarchy.

II. The Easter Controversy. In determining the date for the Easter festival the Celts followed a method which was widely, though not generally, in vogue on the continent at the time when Christianity was planted among them. The Council of Nicaea, in 325, had prescribed a certain calculation for this purpose, but the application of its rules did not at once produce general unity. As late as 525, i.e. two hundred years after the great Council, the Italian monk Dionysius Exiguus, devised a method which seemed to be fully satisfactory. It was officially adopted by Rome, and rapidly gained ground on the continent. But meanwhile the Island Celts had been practically cut off from communication with Rome by the turmoil of the Migration of Nations. Hence they

2 PLUMMER, *Venerabilis Baedae Opera Historica*, Vol. I, Text; Vol. II, Notes. Clarendon Press. Referred to in this paper as Plummer.

continued to employ the calculation which their first Apostle had taught them. They went by an eighty-four year cycle, i.e., after each eighty-four years the dates of Easter would again follow in exactly the same succession. The cycle had originated from Asia Minor. The Roman calculation supposed another cycle. It is often called a nineteen year cycle, and in fact it is based on such a cycle which had been devised in Alexandria. In reality the Roman cycle ran 532 years.

The chief differences between this and the Celtic cycle were these two. *First.* Both parties held that Easter was to fall on the first Sunday after the first full moon of spring. But the Romans considered the 21 of March as the beginning of spring, the Celts the 25 of that month. If therefore a full moon fell between these dates, the Romans accepted it as the first full moon of spring, and celebrated their Easter on the succeeding Sunday,—while the Celts waited a whole month for the next full moon. In the year 604, for instance, the Roman Easter was on the 22 of March; the Celtic on the 19 of April. *Second.* If the first full moon of spring fell on a Sunday, the Romans placed their Easter on the Sunday following; the Celts chose that very date of the full moon. Hence it happened not rarely, that the two Easters were just one week apart, the Celtic being the first. Another consequence of this rule was that the Romans could go as far as April 25 with their Easter, while the last date possible for the Celtic Easter was April 22.

Rome had adopted the Dionysian calculation, and certainly wanted it to be introduced everywhere. But it does not seem that any formal law or decree or Canon to that effect was issued, or that a definite penalty was threatened for not following the lead of Rome. Had this been the case, the advocates of the Roman Easter would not have failed to quote it. Although they advanced the will of the Sovereign Pontiff and laid great stress upon it in their writings and addresses, they gave much more space to what they thought were the merits of the Dionysian reckoning. The Celts proceeded in a similar manner. Theological and mystic reasons were put forward, authorities appealed to, and on the side of the Celts national considerations were not lacking. The Celts erroneously derived their eighty-four year cycle of Easter dates from St. John the Apostle. The Romans equally erroneously claimed St. Peter as the originator

of their system. We may say, however, that whenever the Celts abandoned their own Easter, it was felt to be an act of submission to the Holy See and the Prince of the Apostles. Indeed the order of the Pope is the only peremptory reason for the date of Easter and any other feast. He possesses the supreme power to regulate all public worship, and his decisions must be accepted by all who wish to call themselves true members of the Church of Christ.

THE CESSATION OF THE CELTIC EASTER CALCULATION

The Paschal calculation of the Island Celts did not come to an end in all parts of the Celtic world at one time. It disappeared at various times, in the various parts, in the course of some one hundred and twenty years. Nor were the districts which successively abandoned it geographically contiguous. Almost the only source for our knowledge of these events is the Ecclesiastical History of England by the Venerable Bede, though here and there other historical documents must be consulted. In several cases a very prominent, nay a decisive rôle is played by learned and unselfish personages. As on so many other occasions of history God here also bestows His blessings through the instrumentality of men, just as He often permits great evils to come through the activity of evil-minded and ill-instructed men.

I. Southern Ireland, about 632. Concerning the South of Ireland St. Bede is not any too definite. Pope Honorius, he says (lib. II, 19), wrote a letter to the nation of the Scoti (i.e. the Irish in Ireland), whom he had heard to err in the celebration of Easter, to induce them to adopt the right method. Pope Honorius I ruled the Church 625-638. St. Bede gives no year for his letter. Nor is it clear whether the Scoti to whom it is addressed were in the North or the South of Ireland. Bede continues, "But John also directed an epistle full of authority and instruction about the same error to the Scoti." Again no date of this letter is given. The Pope in question, however, can only be John IV, whose short Pontificate was 640-642.[3]

Utilizing information gleaned from other sources Charles Plummer, author of the best edition of St. Bede's historical works, harmonizes these facts as follows. (Vol. II, p. 125) "In

3 "Johannes, qui successori ejusdem Honorii Severino successit."

631 delegates from a South Irish synod were at Rome, having been sent to consult the Roman Church on the Easter question. While there they had an opportunity of seeing with their own eyes how widely their own use might diverge from that of the rest of the Western Church, for in that year there was a difference of a month between the Roman and Celtic Easters. Probably these men brought back with them the letter of Honorius I. On their return another synod was apparently held, and the Roman Easter adopted. This must have been in 632 or 633." That this date is not far from being correct follows from another passage of Bede. (Lib. III, 26.) When speaking of the end of the controversy in Northumbria he states that the new Abbot-Bishop was Tuda, "who had been educated among the southern Irish, had the ecclesiastical tonsure, and followed the Catholic rule in keeping Easter". If Tuda was old enough to become bishop in 664, the southern Irish must have adopted the Roman Easter some thirty years before that time. Another testimony of St. Bede connected with the coming of St. Aidan, in 635, states the same. "The races of the Scoti, who live in the southern parts of Ireland, had long ago by the admonitions of the Bishop of the Apostolic See learned to celebrate Easter according to the canonical rule." (Lib. III, 3.) There can therefore be no doubt that the southern Irish conformed to the Roman Easter calculation early in the thirties of the seventh century, soon after 630 A. D. How far the district of southern Ireland extended we do not know. The letter of Pope John IV was expressly addressed to bishops and abbots in present Ulster. It cannot have produced any great effect, as we shall see later on.

II. Northumbria, 664. There had not been any special occasion in southern Ireland for the change except the desire to conform in all things with Rome. It was different in Northumbria, the great northernmost kingdom of the Anglo-Saxon Heptarchy. (III 25 and 26.) Here the two Easters literally clashed. Missionaries originally sent from Rome adhered to the Roman method. The zealous Irish monks who had come from Iona and had converted the greater part of the kingdom, followed the eighty-four years cycle. The discord entered the royal family, King Oswiu siding with the Irish, his wife, Queen Eanfled and her chaplain Romanus adhering to the Roman reckoning. To settle this dissension King Oswiu, in 664, summoned an

assembly of the great men of his realm to meet at Whitby, where the bishops and priests were to discuss the matter.'

Colman, the successor of St. Aidan in the see of Lindisfarne, defended the Celts, while Wilfrid, Abbot of Ripon and intimate friend of the king's son Alchfrid spoke for the Roman view. When Wilfrid stated that the Roman calculation was derived from St. Peter, the king declared he was going to follow St. Peter, "because" he said, "he is the doorkeeper of Heaven, and I fear that if I do not adhere to him, he will exclude me from the Kingdom of Heaven." Unwittingly he thereby gave the only real reason for the Roman Easter, namely, the authority of the Sovereign Pontiff. In spite of his great veneration for Bishop Colman he let it be known that he would not tolerate in his kingdom any ecclesiastics who refused to conform to Rome. Hence Colman with some thirty Irish and Anglo-Saxon monks left the country and returned to Iona. The departure of these otherwise excellent men was a considerable loss for religion in Northumbria, which was compensated for only by the great advantage of complete disciplinary unity, an advantage most important in a land where nearly all Christians were converts and necessarily imperfectly instructed in their religion. No Irish missionaries arrived any longer from the North.

The victory of the Roman Easter settled the question for the rest of the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms. St. Theodore, sent five years later by the Pope to be Archbishop of Canterbury and Primate of England, does not seem to have encountered any difficulty in this regard. St. Bede, who otherwise lays the greatest stress on the conformity with Rome, mentions this question only once more in connection with the Anglo-Saxon world, namely when he states that in the first national council held by St. Theodore at Heresford in 673 one canon insisted on the observance of the paschal reckoning of Rome.

III. Many of the Northern Irish and Britons. The next great advance that was made was due to the efforts of St. Adamnan. This learned and holy Irishman was abbot of Iona. In 686 he went as ambassador to Alchfrid, King of Bernicia (the northern half of Northumbria) to ask for the return of Irish captives, whom according to an ancient Irish source he was able to send

4 For a more detailed description of the procedure and character of this assembly see *Catholic Historical Review*, Vol. VII, 1927-8, pp. 620-629.

back to Ireland. But being received with great kindness by Alchfrid, he tarried a long time among the Anglo-Saxons and conversed with the learned ecclesiastics of the country. He also paid a visit to the monastery of Wearmouth-Jarrow. He became fully convinced of the correctness of their Easter calculation. Upon his return he made every possible effort to induce his monks at Iona to abandon the Celtic eighty-four year Easter cycle. But his endeavors were in vain. The monks refused to obey their own venerable abbot and stuck to their peculiarities. Adamnan then sailed over to northern Ireland. Here he was much more fortunate. By his kind instructions he persuaded a number of Irish institutions to align themselves with the rest of the Church. But those monasteries which were under the power of Iona imitated the mother house and retained their Celtic Easter.

Adamnan went several times to Northumbria. On these trips he passed through the territory of the Strathclyde Britons and improved the opportunity by speaking on the same subject to their ecclesiastics. Here, too, he succeeded to a considerable extent. A number of them abandoned the Celtic calculation and adopted that of Rome.

This conversion of the northern Irish, if we may call it so, and of the Strathclyde Britons must have taken place about 690. After his frustrated attempt to win over his own monastery, Adamnan stayed in Ireland among those who had listened to his words. When an old man of nearly eighty years he returned once more to Iona to make a last effort. It was as fruitless as the first. He died there in the first months of the next year, before the difference between him and his stubborn monks became practical. Divine Providence, says St. Bede, took him away, lest the quarrel with them should become aggravated by the actual presence of the two Easter dates. The year of his death is variously given, 703, 704, 705. The following consideration, closely connected with our subject, seems to bespeak 704. The two Easter dates for those three years, the Roman and the Celtic respectively, are these.

703, April 8 and April 1;
704, March 30 and April 20;
705, April 19 and April 12.

In 703 as well as in 705 the Roman Easter was a week after the Celtic. In these years the monks would simply have smiled at St. Adamnan (and his companions) when he continued his fast a week longer. But it would have roused their anger to the utmost, if in 704 he would have celebrated his Roman Easter while they were in the middle of Lent. It would have caused a regular uproar among them. Hence the year 704 is much more adapted to show in his earlier death a design of Divine Providence than are either 703 or 705. We may presume, therefore, that St. Adamnan died in 704 A. D.

From the few other facts I have had the time to gather concerning the life of St. Adamnan it appears to me that he was a highly educated man, a man who inclined to reason, a mild and lovable character who endeavored to attain his end by kind instruction, who at the same time and in a much nobler way than his Iona monks was tenacious of his purpose. It rouses our admiration to see how this great man after being practically exiled from his own home by his indocile and recalcitrant subjects, and with one foot in the grave makes one last appeal with his dying breath to recall them to reason.

IV. Many of the Cornish Britons. St. Adamnan had made the beginning of the propagation of the Roman Paschal computation among the Britons. He gained those of Stratheclyde, or at least many of them. These Britons were under the political control of Northumbria. In the South the Kingdom of Wessex had conquered another part of British territory, namely Cornwall. Meanwhile St. Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury, had perfected the organization of the Anglo-Saxon dioceses and introduced the custom of celebrating national synods. By order of one of these synods (we do not know where and in what precise year it was held) St. Aldhelm, then Abbot of Malmsbury, wrote a lengthy letter to the Britons of Cornwall. St. Aldhelm was a prominent figure in the Anglo-Saxon world. By his Latin writings, however bombastic we may find them, he contributed greatly to the spread of Roman education, besides showing a wide range of encyclopedic knowledge. His letter was addressed to "King" Geraint, named by him Gerontius.[5] A large number of

5 The text of this letter is reprinted by Haddan and Stubbs, in *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents Relating to Great Britain and Ireland*, Vol. III, pp. 268-273.

the Cornish Britons accepted the Roman Easter, though we do not know whether "King" Gerontius was among them. (V 18) Here, as in Strathclyde, we do not see that any pressure was exercised by the Anglo-Saxon overlords, who evidently permitted their new subjects to arrange their religious affairs as they themselves chose.

Thus the Roman Easter had conquered both the northern and the southern peninsulas of the Britons. The central part, Wales, was to conform last of all. The next Celtic land to which we have to turn is the Kingdom of the Picts.

V. The Kingdom of the Picts. As the Picts had been Christianized chiefly by monks from Iona, and were under their spiritual care, they of course celebrated Easter according to the Celtic custom. But the controversy was transferred to them from the neighboring Northumbria, where since 664 the Roman Easter was in vogue. To decide the question King Naiton (Nechtan) of the Picts sent to the famous twin monastery of Wearmouth-Jarrow to ask for information. Abbot Ceolfrid answered the inquiry. In a long letter—it covers nearly twelve pages in Bede—he set forth the theoretical reasons for the Roman calculation. He also mentioned the visit of St. Adamnan to his monastery and recounted how this eminent scholar had become convinced of the necessity of a change. King Naiton, who seriously doubted the correctness of the national custom, was won over completely. When the letter was read to him in a solemn gathering, which must have been of the nature of the assembly at Whitby, he rose from his seat, and on bended knee gave thanks to God for having received such a precious gift from the land of the Angles. "And I declare here solemnly before all here present, that I want this date of Easter to be observed by my whole nation." Without delay notifications were sent out throughout the kingdom, and with them the Roman Easter tables, to be copied, studied, and observed everywhere.[6] On this occasion St. Bede mentions also the Celtic tonsure more explicitly than in any other place. "All the ministers of the altar and the monks," he says, "received the crown-shaped tonsure. The whole nation rejoiced to have entered as it were

6 Bede here speaks of the Roman cycle as of nineteen years. In reality the Roman cycle was of 532 years, and Bede himself had worked it out entirely, but it was based on a nineteen-year cycle.

into a new allegiance to the Prince of the Apostles and to possess a new claim to his protection."

Another ancient source, the *Annals of Tighernach*, reports under the year 717: "The communities of the Iona monks were expelled across the mountains." King Naiton was in earnest. After kindness, which we must suppose was first employed, had not produced the desired result, he acted as King Oswiu of Northumbria had, and expelled those who refused to conform. We need not take this too tragically, however. St. Bede expressly states, that ALL accepted the Roman tonsure. Hence the number of those who preferred exile can have been only a small fraction.[7]

VI. Iona. We now approach the introduction of the Roman Easter into the very citadel of hereditary Iro-Celtic usages, the mighty Abbey of Iona, the backbone of most of the resistance offered in other places to the champions of the Dionysian computation. Adamnan, its own abbot, one of the greatest men of his time, had seen his efforts frustrated by the stubborn particularism of the monks. The submission of Iona is connected with another prominent name, that of St. Egbert. This Saint was the scion of a Northumbrian family of high nobility. In his youth he went to Ireland for the sake of study and the practice of piety. While there he was seized by a contagious disease, which swept the whole island. He vowed that, if God would grant him more time for penance, he would never return to his native land, and devote his years to severe austerities. He recovered, and conscientiously carried out his vow. But the voluntary banishment from his beloved land did not dull his supernatural love for the welfare of his race. He decided to sail over to the continent, and preach the Gospel to his pagan kinsmen, the Frisians and Saxons. He had already chosen able companions and gathered provisions for the long trip, when a young monk informed him of a vision he had had the preceding night. The young monk's teacher, Boisil, had appeared to him and ordered him to tell Egbert that the proposed undertaking would not be carried out. Instead of going to the Frisians, Egbert was to go to Iona and preach to the monks there.

7 The *Annals of Tigernach* are here quoted from Plummer, II, 331. If the statement is correct, a difficulty arises from the other statement, made by St. Bede, that Iona gave up the Celtic computation in 715, in which year St. Egbert arrived in that monastery. However, Plummer rightly remarks, page 335, that Egbert may have taken his time in carrying out his plan.

Egbert took no notice of this message, and bade the young messenger to keep it a secret, since the whole might be merely an ordinary dream. Secretly, however, he feared the vision might be genuine. After a few days the young man returned. Boisil had appeared to him again and reproached him for not speaking to Egbert forcibly enough. "Go now," he said, "and tell him he must go to the monasteries of Columbkil (i.e. Iona and the institutions dependent on it), whether he likes it or not, because their plows do not go straight. He must direct them into the straight line." Egbert evidently feared a mission to Iona and its dependent convents more than a trip to the wild and far-off Frisians. Though he could no longer doubt the genuinity, he made an attempt, as once the Prophet Jonas did, to escape the hand of God. He had all his provisions and other things which were destined for the voyage put into the boat, and only waited for a favorable wind. But one night a terrible storm arose, threw the vessel on the shore, and destroyed part of its lading. Then at last he resolved to give up the undertaking. He sent, however, several Anglo-Saxons, who had received their education in Ireland, to Frisia, among them St. Willibrord, the Apostle of the Netherlands and fatherly friend of St. Boniface.

St. Egbert, says Bede, was a most amiable teacher, who carried out by his example what he taught by words. He was therefore gladly listened to by everybody. He began his mission by winning over the convents in northern Ireland, which were subject to Iona, and after some eleven or twelve years ventured on the dreaded journey to the head monastery itself. He was received by the monks with great honor and joy. A change of mind had evidently taken place at Iona since the days of Adamnan. Possibly the defection of their monasteries in Ireland, and the catastrophe among the Picts, together with the renown of sanctity and learning which had preceded his arrival, made them more pliable. Moreover, their position among the Irish themselves was now completely altered. The whole Irish nation had become Roman. The Iona monks were holding out not only against the Church of the continent but also against their own kinsmen. Could they afford to be more Irish than the Irish?

St. Egbert came to Iona in 716. Though he was received so cheerfully, the change does not seem to have taken place at once, because according to the Annals of Tighernach the refugees from Pictland arrived in 717. Had Iona accepted the Roman Easter in 716, the fact no doubt would have become known in the neighboring country in the institutions depending on Iona. Probably all the Iona monks among the Picts would have followed their example. At any rate they would not have gone to Iona had they known of its action concerning Easter. It would be quite in keeping with the mild character of Egbert, that although the soil appeared to be pretty well prepared he did not urge the matter unduly. For a year or two even two Easters may have been celebrated at Iona. The text of St. Bede, however, rather strongly suggests, though not by so many words, that such a period of transition, if it existed at all, lasted could not have very long. Iona gave up its separatistic and now completely isolated position.

The man who had conquered this last stronghold remained in Iona for the rest of his long life and continued his practices of prayer and penance. During these years Easter was celebrated on the Roman date which was always different from the Celtic. In 729, the ninetieth of St. Egbert's life, Easter fell on April 24, a date on which it could not have fallen according to the discarded reckoning, which permitted no Easter after April 22. On this day the venerable old man celebrated the solemn High Mass, and died the same afternoon. The monks saw in this coincidence a divine approbation of the step the Saint had so ably advocated and which they had taken some twelve years before.[8]

St. Bede loved the Irish, and was fully conscious of the debt of gratitude which the Saxons owed to their neighbors. When reporting the end of the Whitby conference, in consequence of which those who refused to conform to the Roman Easter were obliged to leave Northumbria, he pays them a high tribute for their virtues and abilities. "Their whole endeavor," he says, "was to serve God and not the world. Hence there was in those days the greatest reverence for the monastic habit. Wherever

8 Wm. Bright, in *Chapters of Early English Church History*, p. 469, asserts, without giving any authority, that "a section of the monks set up a new abbot, and this schism lasted for nearly sixty years."

a monk showed himself, he was received with joy as a servant of God. If a priest happened to come into a village, the villagers would flock around him to hear the word of Life. For the monks had no other purpose in coming into any village, except to preach, baptize, or visit the sick." (III 27.)

The only thing he deplored in many passages of his book was the difference in the celebration of the greatest festival of the Church. The more does he rejoice, when finally this also disappeared. He finds a special act of Divine Providence in the fact that this had come about greatly by the coöperation of Saxons. That race which had gladly and abundantly communicated to the Saxons the heavenly doctrine, was itself brought by the Saxons, who owed it so much and had possessed so little, to the full practice of Catholic life. (V 22.)

VII. The Britons of Wales. We have still to see how the Easter controversy came to an end in the center portion of the land of the Britons, i.e. in Wales. St. Bede closed his busy life in 735. The introduction of the Roman Pasch in Iona was one of the very last events he was able to report to posterity in his *Ecclesiastical History.* The Britons of Wales remained much longer in their particularistic attitude.[9] The sources to which we must turn concerning this point give us very scant information. We have only a few entries in the *Annales Cambrenses.* Under the year 755 they tell us, that North Wales accepted the Roman Easter upon the urgings of Bishop Elvod (Elfod) of Bangor, but that the other bishops (those of South Wales are meant) did not concur therein. In 777, however, South Wales also conformed. But this did not finish the matter. Bishop Elvod lived to a very old age. When he died, in 809, the chronist says, "a great tumult occurred among the ecclesiastics on account of Easter, because the Bishops of Llandaff and Menevia (in South Wales) would not succumb to the Archbishop of North Wales (i.e. Bangor), being themselves Archbishops of older privilege."[10] How long this controversy, which evidently re-

9 From this time dates a letter written by Pope Gregory III to the bishops of Bavaria and Alemannia, warning them against British priests. "Gentilitatis ritum et doctrinam vel venientium Brittonum vel falsorum sacredotum . . . renuentes ac prohibentes abjiciatis." TANGL, *Die Briefe des heiligen Bonifatius und Lullus,* page 71.

10 For these entries see HADDON and STUBBS, *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents Relating to Great Britain and Ireland,* Vol. I, p. 204.

ceived much of its acrimoniousness from getting mixed up with a question of jurisdiction, may have lasted, our sources do not disclose. In later centuries no difference between the Britons and their eastern and western neighbors on the point of the date of Easter is mentioned again.

Another particularity of the Island Celts has been briefly alluded to in this paper, namely, the difference in the shape of the tonsure. The Celts would shear the front part of the head to a line from ear to ear. The Roman tonsure consisted of a crown of hair left around the upper part of the head, while all the rest was shaved away. (This tonsure is still worn by many religious.) Theoretical and ascetical considerations were adduced for and against each of them. The advocates of the Roman tonsure held that theirs was St. Peter's tonsure, that of the Celts being the tonsure of Simon Magus. Concerning this point also there was *quaestio non minima*, quite a dispute, as St. Bede says in connection with the conference at Whitby. But the impression one gains from St. Bede's reports is that it was looked upon as of subordinate importance. The Roman tonsure was accepted with the Roman Easter, simply as a consequence, and it is scarcely ever mentioned in the later references to the controversy.

Conclusion. We may be tempted to think that after all the Easter Question was of little moment. What does it matter on what date Easter is celebrated as long as it is kept with that devotion and solemnity which is befitting for so great a festival, and as long as every Christian leads a life in full conformity with the principles of his religion. Yet we should observe how seriously this question was taken by all the great men of the time. We know that two Popes wrote vigorous letters to the Irish on this point. Such men as St. Wilfrid, St. Adamnan, St. Ceolfrid, St. Egbert, worked indefatigably for its settlement. St. Bede himself, to whom we owe most of our knowledge of these struggles, looked upon those particularistic tendencies as a calamity.

These tendencies were indeed, objectively speaking, a standing disobedience towards the supreme authority in the Church. The constant appeal to theoretical and mystic considerations for or against the Roman Easter was a permanent danger for dragging dogmatic questions into the controversy, a practice

which might have opened the door for the gradual introduction of incorrect, perhaps even heretical views. Or further resistance might have driven the opposing party into a formal schism. The double Easter was particularly dangerous for the Anglo-Saxons. They were new in the Faith. They attached great importance to exterior things. That the two Easters stood for two different religions was a conclusion which might have been readily drawn by these children of nature. The reason why it was not drawn was no doubt the edifying life of their Apostles and the harmony which otherwise existed among the preachers of the word of God. St. Bede rightly thinks that it was this edifying life of the Celts which merited from God the grace of coming finally into the full union with the center and heart of Christianity. Unquestionably the life blood of the Church from this time on flowed still more freely and invigoratingly through the veins of the communities of the Island Celts.

FRANCIS S. BETTEN, S.J.,
Marquette University,
Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

AN IMPORTANT CHAPTER IN AMERICAN CHURCH HISTORY (1625-1650)

American historians usually date the origin of the Catholic Church in the United States from Calvert's settlers in Maryland in 1634. Yet, years before the charter of Maryland had received the royal signature, Rome had been devising means to send missionaries into the English colonies and had established spiritual jurisdiction over New England in regular form. These facts constituting the first chapter of American Church History have never yet been recorded, because the documents recording them are still unpublished.

In 1622, the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda Fide was established at Rome and began to provide for the spiritual welfare of Catholics living in countries that were non-Catholic in government. Ecclesiastical jurisdiction was established in new countries outside Europe in rapid succession. *One of the first countries thus brought under the spiritual sway of Propaganda was New England.*

The attention of the Propaganda was first directed to the newly-planted British colonies of North America by the Discalced Carmelite, Friar Simon Stock of Holy Mary Doughty (or Dawson). Friar Simon Stock was born at Plombley, Lincolnshire, in 1574, and was ordained in Rome in the year 1610, after having spent some years in the English College there. Entering the Carmelite Order in 1612, he proceeded to London in 1615, where he labored until his death, August 15, 1652. He was the first English Carmelite missionary to England after the Reformation. In London, Friar Simon Stock had been entrusted with important negotiations that were greatly facilitated by his acquaintance with the Spanish ambassador, Queen Anne of Denmark, etc. Nevertheless, he was never secure from priest-hunters (Cath. Encycl. III, p. 364).

In 1625, Friar Simon wrote to the Propaganda regarding the emigration of Puritans to New England. This letter has not yet been discovered. Propaganda thereupon instructed the General of the Carmelite Order to send Friar Simon over to New England. However, Friar Simon found it impossible to execute this order and addressed under date of April 22nd, 1626, the

following letter to Propaganda which on account of its importance may be given here in its entirety. The letter (written in Italian) is preserved in the Propaganda Archives (Scritture Antiche, Vol. 101, fol. 14).

"Most Illustrious and Reverend Lords:

"I have sent you the map of America, from which you may see that there is probably a passage to Japan and China through North America, so that it is not necessary to pass through the equinoctial or tropical stream or the temperate zone, what would be a great benefit to the Holy Church and an easy voyage. You may see also that the English heretics possess the best part of North America, namely the one which corresponds to Italy, Spain, Hungary, France and so forth, lying in the temperate zone; there the pagans are more mild, humane, frank, brave, agile and accustomed to endurance than the others, and they are pretty nice and well proportioned in their build. They are all white, when they are born, but they become dusky later as a result of not protecting themselves against the rays of the sun and of painting themselves to look more terrible in war. Some men and squaws have been brought over here to England and they are not different from those of Europe, and one of them took part in the last wars of Bohemia. Our Holy Faith is all that is missing to make them like the Italians.

"Among the other plantations which the heretical Englishmen have established in North America on the same line, the Polar elevation and latitude of Rome, a town was built upon hills like those of Rome and a fort, where three years ago two ministers or preachers were stationed, but lately some others have gone there to corrupt that tribe by their heresy. On the above mentioned map that town is called Plimouth. Your Most Illustrious Lordships will find that place looking at the latitude of Rome and the longitude of degree 32. You will see the Island *of which I have written before* and notice, how convenient a place it is to commence the conversion of this part of the world which is as large as that of Europe. No missions were ever made there, except such by heretics.

"Our Father General has written me that Your Most Illustrious Lordships have requested him to send me alone to that Island. If your Most Illustrious Lords would deign to grant or procure me permission to establish first this English mission

to such an extent that it would later assist and supply the new mission with missionaries and articles which are missing yet, I would most willingly go there, where there are more persecutions than here or greater difficulties to do good. I can only go to Genova and I will go there, if the means will be procured which are necessary to make it a success: however, in things spiritual it is not necessary to chase wild geese and to make the conversion of pagans through indiscretion still more difficult than it is already, and the Apostolic missions odious from failures caused by weak foundations and slender means. If the Religious of other orders who have here novitiates and colleges for Englishmen and through these means have an abundance of missionaries and plenty temporal means to live conformably to their state, (2), who have superiors of experience and discernment, capable to furnish the missionaries with every thing that is necessary, (3), who have active and passive voices whereby they govern well, (4), who have sufficient faculties, if they in spite of all this find it hard to work at the conversion of pagans, it must be much more difficult for us who are wanting in all these things.

"Here there are only five of us. Two of them are in prison, two are sick, and I sustain the mission; and since I have many converts, they will be lost, if I leave them in the persecution; and when I go alone 2,000 miles, I will be deprived of the benefits of the sacraments and may be lost myself, and since I have not the faculty to consecrate a portable altar, I cannot say Mass.

"I give myself over into the hands of Your Most Illustrious Lords who may govern me as they wish and may send me, wherever they choose, giving me leave to observe the commandments and customs of Holy Church and providing means necessary to labor with success among the pagans and to save my soul.

"Finally embracing etc. Your Most Humble Servant

Fr. Simon Stock. London, April 22, 1626.

This letter proves in an unmistakable manner that Propaganda had already ordered at the beginning of 1626 that a missionary should proceed to Massachusetts to labor at the conversion of the Indians. The project miscarried from reason detailed in the letter.

The following year a new, but different, project was put forth and eventually carried into effect, namely the establishment of a mission among the English settlers of North America.

Lord Baltimore had purchased a plantation in Newfoundland in the year 1620 which he named Avalon. In 1623 he had received a grant of the southeastern peninsula which was erected into the Province of Avalon. After he had become a Catholic in 1624, he tried to procure priests for his colony. Propaganda again ordered Friar Simon Stock to send some of his confrères to this new mission. Friar Bede of the Blessed Sacrament (John Hiccoks), a converted Puritan, had been inclined to accept the offer, but when the faculties from Rome arrived, he was in prison, having been surprised by the priest—hunters, while writing to his superiors (Cath. Encycl. III, p. 364). Later two secular priests volunteered to go to Newfoundland whose names are learned from a report written in August, 1630. Finally, in 1627, Lord Baltimore went to Avalon in company with the two priests Anthony Smith and Thomas De Longueville to observe conditions in the province and to establish a colony, where all might enjoy freedom in worshipping God. He landed at Ferryland, the chief settlement of the province, and remained there until the autumn. On his return in the following spring he brought with him his family, priests, and about forty colonists.

On June 27, 1628, Friar Simon Stock wrote to Propaganda:

"I have sent you Most Illustrious Lords the map which you wish to have and I have sent two kinds, one printed in 1624 and another of the year 1628, which latter is darker.

"I have not answered you Most Illustrious Lords on the point of sending Religious to the new mission, because I had none to send and the two who went there last year, were secular priests. *This year others went* there and among them the one, of whom I had written to you, when I first wrote to Your Lordship about this mission. Also other spiritual children of mine went with them. I have advised the priests to send one of their own to Rome, as soon as the mission is a little better established, to make a report and to apply for help from Holy Church as to what they shall do. Should any of them return here and the time be more quiet, I shall write more about it." . . . The rest treats of England.

This letter, dated "London on June 27, 1628," and preserved in Propaganda Archives (Scritture Antiche. Vol. 102, fol. 11) is likewise written in Italian. The conversion of Indians, however, was not overlooked by Propaganda. In a later letter, a summary of which is given in the same volume of the Propaganda Archives (fol. 12v), Friar Simon Stock informs the Roman authorities that the "Indians of Avalon are all poor and that neither Catholic priests nor heretical preachers have ever gone there, that the people have become as savage as the bears of the country, and that men of 70 years have never been baptized. This is what the *four* missionaries have reported."

However, the Catholic colony in Newfoundland was partially abandoned and Friar Simon Stock sent another report to the Propaganda from London, on January 1, 1631 (Propaganda Archiv., Scritt. antiche, vol. 100, fol. 150). "Regarding the affairs of Avalon," he writes, "two Fathers of the Society [of Jesus] went there about Easter of 1629 and returned here [London] before the following Christmas (1629); they took back with them almost all Catholics who were there leaving behind about thirty heretics and two or three Catholic women, but no priests or any Ministers. They report that the winter previous to their arrival had been extremely cold and that the country is barren. I have spoken with the Lord Principal of that place and he said that he has regretted having returned and now intends once more to go back. He told me also that the Fathers of the Society have charge of or special commission for these districts of America." But in the next year the grant of Maryland was obtained and Avalon was completely abandoned.

A Latin Report concerning Calvert's colony in Newfoundland, written in August 1630, and sent to Propaganda by the Belgian Nuncio on September 21st following (Propaganda Archiv. Scritt. ant., vol. 259, fol. 2), supplies some further information. "In the northern part of West India," [this relation states] "lies a country which the English call New England or the Newly Found Land, distant from England about two month's voyage. Not quite four years ago Lord Baltimore, George Calvert received leave to establish a colony there in company with another nobleman of equal rank, but a heretic. To avoid future ligitations about territorial limits, the King drew the lines of their respective properties. Both took care to send colonists there.

Calvert took with him besides Protestants also some Catholics who gladly went along to avoid the persecution which was just commencing. With them took ship also two Secular priests, Rev. Anthony Smith and Thomas of Longueville. When they landed, they found the country uninhabited and for some months did not see any body else. Regarding the practice of religion, under one roof Mass was celebrated in one part of the house, while the heretics held their services in another part. Calvert and the priests together with various Catholics returned to England after a short stay; the same was done by some persons of the other colony of heretics. After their return to England they praised the Newly Found Land very much, thereby raising a desire in others to see that country, as soon as an opportunity would present itself. However, about five months ago some Puritans made up their mind to go there. This resolution was, as it appears, the result of their sectarian fanaticism. When they saw that the chapel of Her Majesty the Queen of England was opened and the Catholic religion was practiced rather freely, that also Capuchins had come to England even with the consent of the King, they thought that the downfall of the gospel was imminent. On this account very many decided to emigrate to New England, among them not a few noble and rich men. The number of those who eventually left for the country, is set down as being about two thousand. When the King of England noticed that the Puritans were leaving the Kingdom and emigrating to other countries, he exacted two oaths from all emigrants to New England, an oath of allegiance and another, whereby they declared that the Pseudo-Archbishop of Canterbury be the true and legitimate Primate of England. Most people took both oaths, but later many refused to do so, because they regarded such oaths as conflicting with the tenets of Puritanic Anarchy." (On March 4, 1630, third Sunday in Lent, the Queen's Chapel in London was first opened and five months later the above report was written). Cardinal Bentivoglio gave a summary of this Report in the meeting of Propaganda on November 30, 1630. Passing over the tolerance of heretical worship in Avalon, as if such policy were blameless in every regard, he unequivocally sanctioned Lord Baltimore's principles of religious freedom as practiced first in Avalon and later in Maryland. The *cradle of religious liberty was first*

rocked upon the barren shores of Newfoundland in 1627 and this system found favor with the Roman authorities from the very beginning.

Lord Baltimore perceived the precarious situation of his Province of Avalon in 1627, and on his return requested a new grant in a more southern climate. In 1629, before word had come from the King, he went to Virginia to explore the country with a view to a future plantation, but was rudely rebuffed by the Protestant settlers. Returning to England, he received from King Charles I, a grant of land south of the James River and requested the Discalced Carmelite Friar Simon Stock to take charge of this mission. Friar Simon informed Propaganda about this proposal and received instructions to go to Virginia. Eventually, however, neither Friar Simon nor his two companions saw fit to act upon this order. Friar Simon gives his reasons in a letter, (written in Italian) toward the end of 1629. It is preserved without giving the date, in the Propaganda Archives (Scritture Antich. vol. 189, fol. 247, and Scritture rifer., America Centrale, vol. I, fol. 5-6). This letter bears the heading: "Relation sent by the Discalced Carmelite Fathers, who are in England, in regard to a Mission proposed to the Sacred Congregation by Father Simon Stock of the same Order in the country of Virginia, called New England, at the request of two Catholic English Cavaliers." Friar Simon writes as follows: "About the year 1603 the English had begun to settle there and at present have there three colonies. The first consists of 50 houses, the second of 20 houses, and the third of 15 and this last one, I believe, is the one into which I was requested to go by the two Cavaliers of this Kingdom. This enterprise of planting colonies in said country is undertaken by rich English persons in the hope of making great gain, and these are greatly animated therein by the captains and sailors who set out every year in March for these shores to catch cod and return in September with peltry for sale. The two above mentioned Catholic noblemen are among those who engage in this trade. Persons who had been there informed me that there are no Catholics at present in that country. The two noblemen, therefore, will probably not settle there. It may be, however, that some of their men who are Catholics will go there. The other Englishmen who are settled there at present, are all Protestants and have

their Ministers in every place who try to convert to their religion the savages. Even if our Religious or other ones would go to this country to convert the savages to the true faith, the heretics would oppose them, and if some Catholics should happen to live there, they could not assist them, since they would have a hard time to maintain themselves. For these reasons it seems, therefore, that this mission will be completely fruitless. However, to execute what your Reverence have written me, I have laid the whole project before my companions, the Fathers Eliseus (Pendryck, died 1650), and Elias, and have tried to induce them to go to this mission and do what can be done. I have promised them to procure for them the means of sustenance and have them recalled, as soon as they find that they cannot do anything. But they show no inclination to go and say that the enterprise is beset with greater difficulties than I think and I have made the Lords of Propaganda to believe; yet if there ever should be some reasonable prospect of gaining souls, they would not only be ready to sail two thousand leagues, the distance from here to that country, but around the whole world; if, however, someone has to go there by all means, they say, that I, Friar Simon, should be charged with this mission, since I had broached that affair. In spite of all this what I have written here to Your Reverence, I say that I myself am ready to go there and wheresoever you command me to go, if the two Cavaliers upon whom the whole enterprise rests make it possible for me to do so. I have not been able to get into touch with them for sometime, since they left London on account of the plague. I hear that one of them stays in Ireland, but I cannot write to him, because all communications are stopped on account of the plague. Of the other I have absolutely no news."

Lord Baltimore's project of establishing a plantation in Virginia met with opposition from some of the Virginia Company and was abandoned, before it could be carried out. Later (1632) he received another grant north and east of the Potomac (Maryland).

The ecclesiastical affairs of New England, however, were definitely settled in the year 1630 by the Propaganda, and the various preliminary negotiations extending over a period of five years were brought thereby to a final termination.

The Carmelite Friar Simon Stock wrote among other things to the Propaganda from London on April 28, 1630, the following report (Propaganda Archives, Lettere antiche, vol. 132, fol. 141): "A great number of the Puritan sect have left to settle in North America, in all four thousand and more. They poison the savages with their heresy. I have heard from such who were there that the savages desire to become Christians. There are countless tribes on the coast nearest to Europe."

In the meeting of Propaganda on July 9, 1630, the Assessor of the Holy Office reported concerning this letter of Friar Simon Stock stating that "four thousand English Puritans have gone to North America lying next to Europe to inject it with the Calvinian heresy." Thereupon Propaganda resolved to send instructions to the Belgian Nuncio to gather information upon these points and to send it to them together with his opinion, whether it could be done by sending French missionaries to counteract the efforts of the English (Archives of Propaganda, Lett. antiche, vol. 132, fol. 141v, and Acta de anno 1630, vol. VII, part 1, fol. 99v).

The secretary of Propaganda accordingly wrote to the Nuncio at Brussels, Fabio di Lagonissa, Archbishop of Conza, on July 20, 1630, and the latter sent his report two months later, on September 21, 1630. "I have succeeded," the nuncio writes, "in obtaining information about the matter which you charged me to investigate in your letter of July, the 20th inst., namely about the English Puritans who are emigrating to North America; I have found what you will read in the enclosed relation (" Descriptio Novae Angliae sive Terrae recens inventae", written in August 1630, which has been translated from Latin already). French missionaries would be of the greatest utility for this purpose of going there to check the advances of the Puritans in their very beginning. It should not be difficult to send some also from here, if needs be, since there are likewise Religious here who are fit for this mission. However, what regards the language, English priests would be the best fitted, but it was not possible yet to send more than two of them and we have to wait for their reports, so that this Sacred Congregation may be better qualified to decide what will be to the greater benefit of the propagation of the Holy Faith in those parts of the world. They may also apply for assistance in this affair to the ambas-

sadors of France and Spain who reside in London, so that no obstacle will be placed in the way of these missionaries. Meanwhile I shall do what ever your Eminence shall command me to the best of my powers. Brussels, September 21, 1630. F. Archb. di Conza" (Propag. Archiv., Scritt. ant., vol. 259, fol. 1).

We see from this letter that the nuncio at Brussels was very imperfectly informed about the affairs of New England. The Latin report he had enclosed, was written in August, 1630, in Belgium, evidently at the English College of Douai. It speaks only of the first expedition to the Province of Avalon and the Puritan emigration commencing in April, 1630, while the later developments and final collapse of that colony were not yet known to the writer of that report. Why Propaganda submitted this affair to the consideration of the Belgian nuncio at Brussels rather than to the French nuncio at Paris, is not quite clear. Apparently the Cardinals reckoned with the probability that Spain might still assert her claim to the whole of North America and therefore, might resent the establishment of missions by French missionaries in that territory. In such an eventuality the nuncio of Belgium (which then formed part of the Spanish Kingdom) was in a better position to test the ground than the Papal Envoy at Paris.

Cardinal Bentivoglio gave a summary of the Belgian nuncio's letter and enclosure in the meeting of Propaganda on November 22, 1630, stating "that New England is distant from old England by a voyage of three months' duration and that colonies of English Catholics and Puritans had been transplanted there." Hereupon the Sacred Congregation decided on the same day that "Catholic missionaries should be sent into that New Land as soon as possible who shall impede the progress of Puritans and minister to the Catholic Settlers, and that, therefore, the Procurator General of the Capuchins be charged to arrange with Father Joseph of Paris that a mission of French and English Capuchins be established in New England under the usual conditions, viz. that the said Père Joseph is prefect of the mission and must send a list of the names and number of the missionaries and report some future time about their progress" (Arch. of Propag., Acta de anno 1630, vol. VII, Part 1, fol. 164v, No. 10).

This resolution of Propaganda marks the beginning of the American Church as an organized body, because Propaganda on this date has established ecclesiastical jurisdiction over New England in due form for the first time. Accordingly *November 22, 1630, is the birthday of the present ecclesiastical government in the United States* and the Prefecture Apostolic of New England erected on that day is the nucleus which was to grow into the grand hierarchy of today. It was memorial day, when Propaganda extended first their spiritual jurisdiction over the stretch of land of indefinite limits, called New England, and subjected it to the immediate government of the Holy See through a Prefect Apostolic, the lowest prelate having jurisdiction over an independent territory.

The Capuchin Father Joseph of Paris who was nominated First Prefect Apostolic of New England on November, 22, 1630, was on obscure man in his day. As "right hand" of Cardinal Richelieu, Père Joseph had become very famous throughout Europe. No Religious had wielded as much political power, since the death of Cardinal Ximenes, as this confident of the powerful Cardinal Richelieu. François Leclerc du Tremblay entered the Capuchin Order in 1599, taking the name of Joseph of Paris and styling himself simply "Père Joseph". As such he is known in European history. From 1622 till 1630, Père Joseph founded in rapid succession Capuchin Missions which extended from Persia to England. On February 24, 1630, he sent twelve Capuchins to London who opened on March 4, 1630, as chaplains to the Catholic Queen Henrietta, the Royal Chapel at Somerset Palace in London to the public service of the persecuted Catholics. This event which caused such a stir among the Puritans, as we see from the report quoted above, naturally induced Propaganda to place the new mission to be erected in New England into the hands of the man who had opened through his political influence the doors of the Royal Chapel to the Catholics of Old England (Records of A. C. H. Society, Vol. XXVII, Sept., 1916, pp. 193-198).

The documents, adduced above, proved conclusively that the initiative in this matter was taken by Propaganda, and not, as I formerly stated (Records, p. 196), by the Papal Nuncio at Brussels. This Papal Envoy did not propose to send French Capuchins into New England, but he speaks only of French

missionaries (i.e. Religious) in general favoring sending English priests (i.e. seculars).

The newly nominated Prefect Apostolic of New England, however, was just then absent from Paris on account of business so that he could not arrange this affair. Accordingly the Procurator General of the Capuchin Order petitioned Cardinal Anthony Barberini who was himself a Capuchin, to see to it that Propaganda should give new orders. The Procurator General wrote: "A mission was decreed in the last meeting of Propaganda Fide in presence of His Holiness, when among other things a mission in New England was created and entrusted to the care of Père Joseph of Paris. But this Father was not found at home, so that he could not give attention to this matter. Therefore, I beg Your Eminence to deign to take action that the management will be given to the Procurator who will later arrange this affair either with Père Joseph himself or with others who will be qualified for it" (Archiv. Propag. Lett. Antich. Vol. 391, Fol. 12r). In the next meeting on February 3, 1631, "Cardinal Gaetani reported about this matter and the Sacred Congregation confirmed thereupon the lately decreed Mission of English and French Capuchins to New England commanding the Procurator General of the same Order that he should see to it that the Provincial of the Parisian Capuchins establishes as soon as possible said mission, in case that Père Joseph of Paris who was first charged with this mission be absent from Paris" (Archiv. Propag. Lett. ant. Vol. 391, fol. 12v and Atti., Vol. VII, Part 2, fol. 18, No. 22).

The Secretary of Propaganda wrote likewise on June 22, 1630, to Friar Simon Stock about the affairs of New England. Friar Simon sent from London the following answer on January 1, 1631: "The letter of Your Eminence of June 22, reached me only in December (1630). Regarding the affairs of Avalon etc. (quoted above). . . . "Since now these parts of the world are mostly at peace, and the English, French and Scotch possess colonies in those parts of America, His Holiness may deign to plant in those parts of America a colony of Italians with a Bishop and the poorest Religious accustomed to hardship, that they establish Holy Faith in that part of the world which is as large as Europe and lies near and opposite to Europe, but is not yet converted in the least. This will be a work of the greatest

honor to Holy Church and in the course of time will become very profitable; this is the best way to convert them." . . . (Archives Propag., Lettere antiche, Vol. 100, fol. 150 recto).

When Friar Simon Stock had been informed some time later of the establishment of the Capuchin Mission of New England, he did not hesitate to write his views to Propaganda from London on June 25, 1631. "I am glad to hear that the Sacred Congregation has ordained a mission of Capuchin Fathers in those parts of America. They will reap great fruit, if they proceed guided by discipline and observance. The observance, however, in the missions among pagans must needs be different from that kept in monasteries. It is necessary, therefore, that the Sacred Congregation procures for the missionaries the privilege of active and passive voice among themselves and in the elections of superiors, to establish thereby a modus proce dendi in keeping with the needs of the mission and to remedy inconveniences by means of chapters. If the Capuchin Fathers will observe this and change the form or modes of government according to the needs of the missions, they will be able to convert the whole world." . . . (Archiv. Propag. Lett. antich. Vol. 100, fol. 157 recto). This was a pet idea of Friar Simon. As early as June 27, 1628, he had been clamoring in a letter to Propaganda for introducing the privilege of active and passive voice and chapters among the Religious living in England (Arch. Prop. Lett. ant. Vol. 102, Fol. 11 recto). His letter of June 25, 1631, was submitted to Propaganda for consideration on August 26, 1631 (Lett. Vol. 100, fol. 157 verso).

Apparently no Capuchin missionaries reached New England during the year 1631. Rocco da Cesinale, O. M. Cap. states in his *Storia delle Missioni dei Cappuccini* (Vol. III, Roma 1873, p. 674) that in obedience to Propaganda Père Joseph had sent some of his Brethren of the Paris Province to New England. But this statement seems to be improbable in view of the fact that Père Joseph knew all about the negotiations between England and France regarding the restoration of New France. On July 4, 1631, the Act of rendition of Port Royal and Nova Scotia was drafted and on March 29, 1632, both Canada and Nova Scotia were restored to France by the treaty of Saint-Germain-en-Laye. It seems quite natural that Père Joseph waited for the final settlement of this political affair, before sending mission-

aries to New England. As matters stand, we have absolutely no documents which would warrant the statement that Capuchin missionaries were established in New England during 1631.

The Capuchins of the Paris Province had not yet been able to enter the mission of New England, when Cardinal Richelieu charged them with another mission,—that of New France. On January 20, 1632, fourteen months after Propaganda had entrusted the New England Mission to the Capuchins, Cardinal Richelieu made a contract with William de Caen, whereby he commissioned this "former general of the new marine of France to transport three Capuchin Fathers to Quebec, a province of New France, together with forty men". The Capuchins, however, prompted by a sense of the highest delicacy, as Rochemonteix states (Les Jesuites et la Nouvelle—France, 1, Paris 1895, p. 182), refused to accept this mission which had been formerly in charge of the Recollects and Jesuits. Thereupon Cardinal Richelieu thought it necessary (as his new contract made with de Caen on February 1, 1632, reads), "to send back the Jesuit Fathers to a place which belongs to them, near the fort of Quebec, from which they were expelled by the English. Therefore, I charge said William de Caen to transport them as soon as possible in those ships, in which he should have carried said Capuchin Fathers" (Archiv. du Ministère des Affaires Etrang. à Paris. Vol. 43, fol. 32).

The Capuchins, however, could not escape being charged by Cardinal Richelieu with the mission of Acadia or Nova Scotia and this the more so, since their great friend Isaac de Launoy de Razilly was appointed Governor of that province of New France. On March 27, 1632, Richelieu made a contract with de Razilly wherein he commissioned him to re-occupy Port Royal and Acadia and to convey three Capuchins with some colonists to that country. By that time both Quebec and Port Royal were still in possession of the English and formed part of the British colonies of North America. Two days after, March 29, 1632, England ceded Canada and Acadia to France by the treaty of St. Germain-en-Laye.

Cardinal Richelieu having regained New France, immediately he initiated the final arrangement of the ecclesiastical affairs of the new possessions. On May 31, 1632, "Cardinal Bentivoglio reported about the letters written by the Nuncio of Paris to

Propaganda regarding the establishment of missions of Franciscans, Jesuits and Capuchins in Canada, as they were proposed by the French King, and particularly regarding the Prefecture of the Capuchin mission which should be bestowed upon the Capuchin Fathers Joseph and Leonard of Paris." Accordingly Propaganda decreed at the same meeting of May 31, 1632, that "these missions are approved and that answer should be given to the nuncio to the effect that he should send in the names of the prospective missionaries. Regarding the Capuchin mission in particular, the nuncio should likewise transmit the names of the prospective missionaries and should admonish Père Joseph to send a report to Propaganda about the work of his missionaries; for the Cardinals of Propaganda receive hardly any reports about the work of Capuchin missionaries laboring in the Prefecture of said Fathers Leonard and Joseph, as is done by other missionaries both Capuchins and other Religious" (Archiv. Propaganda Acta de anno 1632, Vol. VIII, fol. 66v, num. 5, Rocco da Cesinale, Missioni dei Cappuccini, Vol. III, p. 676).

Accordingly Père Joseph who had been nominated Prefect of the Mission of New England on Nov. 22, 1630, was likewise nominated Prefect of the Capuchin Mission of Acadia on May 31, 1632, since, however, his many occupations gave him little time to discharge these offices of Prefect properly, another Capuchin, Father Leonard of Paris, was appointed Prefect-Apostolic together with Père Joseph, so that either of them had full powers to act severally as well as jointly.

On July 4, 1632, Razilly set out from Morbihan for Acadia with three ships carrying three hundred persons, among whom were three Capuchins. About five weeks later he anchored before Port Royal (now Annapolis, Nova Scotia), and took possession of the Province of Acadia. The Scotch settlers left the country, 46 persons in all, in January of 1633; only four Scotch families remained who were received into the Catholic Church, *the first converts of North America* (cp. Records of the A. C. Hist. Soc., Vol. XXVII, Philadelphia 1916, pp. 198-202).

Finally, on September 24, 1632, *the two adjoining Prefectures of New England and New France (or Acadia) were merged into the one Prefecture of Canada.* In the meeting of Propaganda on September 24, 1632, Cardinal Anthony Barberini, O. M. Cap., laid before the Cardinals the petition of the Joint- Pre-

fects Father Joseph and Leonard of Paris as to a union of the two Prefectures of North America. This petition found favor and Propaganda decreed at the same day: "Regarding the extension of the mission of New England over to New France, the Sacred Congregation grants the petition of the supplicants and orders that the Holy Office should be appealed to for more extended and ampler faculties" (Archiv. Propaganda, Acta, Vol. VIII, fol. 123v, num. V, Ad 7, Cesinale, op. cit., p. 676).

Père Joseph was continued in his office of Prefect of Canada (or Acadia) and New England until his death on December 18, 1638. Father Leonard Querquifinan of Paris (†1641) became *sole* Prefect after the death of Père Joseph and filled this office until July 18, 1639, when the Provincial of the Paris Capuchin Province was nominated by Propaganda as Prefect (Arch. Propag. Acta. Vol. XIII, fol. 305-308, 359, 374-377, Cesinale, Vol. III, p. 103-104). Soon after (October 1, 1639), Father Archangelus of Fossez (†1670), was nominated Prefect to be succeeded on July 2, 1641, by the celebrated founder of the Capuchin missions in the East, Father Pacificus Lescaille of Provins. Father Pacificus retained this office of Prefect until his death, which occurred during 1649, (he was killed and devoured by cannibal Carib Indians in the West Indies). Finally, the Provincials of the Paris Capuchin Province were nominated Prefects by Propaganda from 1649 till 1654, when the mission was broken up by the English.

The Prefects nominated by Propaganda were subject from 1639 to 1654 to the Provincial of Paris in all things pertaining to their mission and Propaganda appointed every year a French Capuchin to make a canonical visitation of the Prefecture (Arch. Propag., Acta. anni 1639, Vol. XIII, fol. 306, nros 4-5, fol. 374 nros 3-4).

The Capuchin Prefects of the Prefecture of Canada, as it was officially called in the Acts of Propaganda, exercised jurisdiction over New England to an indefinite extent. On February 12, 1639, Father Hyacinth of Paris was nominated Superior of this mission, defined as comprising "New France, Virginia and Florida" (Archiv. Prpag. Scritture Antiche, Vol. 138, fol. 12v, fol. 13v, fol. 23r). Virginia denoted in the 17th century the Southern colonies as well as New England proper. The territory between 34 and 45 north latitude was all termed Virginia

in the grants made by James I to the Virginia Companies in 1606. Mercator's atlas, printed in 1623, marks all the country lying between New France and Florida as Virginia. Accordingly, the *Prefecture of Canada extended over the whole Atlantic coast as far south as the Spanish colonies of Florida.*

However, the limits of the Prefecture of Canada were rearranged in 1641. Father Pacificus of Provins petitioned Propaganda on October 17, 1641, "to add to my decree (nominating him Prefect of Canada) and to our Prefecture these words: 'North America, where there are living French people and where there are no other Religious or secular priests,' because somewhat south of there were found numerous domesticated people. Since the Brief causes difficulties in this regard, I shall be contented, as soon as a letter from the Cardinal Prefect or Cardinal Antonio (Barberini, O. M. Cap.) will explain to me the intention of His Holiness or the Sacred Congregation, that I may track these people throughout North America; for there are no Spaniards living in those places, but only French, English and Dutch" (Arch. Propag. Lettere Antich. Vol. 141, fol. 69r). Monsignor Ingoli, secretary of Propaganda, made the following remark to this letter (l. c. fol. 69v): "As to the third point, it is good to extend the mission of Father Pacificus to North America, where there are no missions yet, because he has no equal in finding tribes by dint of incredible hardships of travel. He was the first to found the Capuchin Missions in Aleppo, Babylon and Persia. From a relation received from New Mexico we learn that in the northern parts of North America towards the West tribes were found who live in villages and similar tribes may be found east of that western part; Father Pacificus has already cognizance of such, as he hints here."

Father Pacificus repeated his petition on November 7, 1641, requesting Propaganda to declare that "under the word Canada should be comprised the whole continent of North America, where the French live and where there are no other Religious; in this way no damage will be done to any one. The Spanish Cardinals cannot object, because we go with Frenchmen and are sure that we will not take possession of those people. The Dutch are just now making ready an embarkation to take hold of them and to corrupt thereby a thousand of these poor people" (Arch. Propaganda Lett. Ant. Vol. 141, fol. 67). Finally, on

February 14, 1642, Propaganda extended the Prefecture of Father Pacificus "to all places of North America, where there will be French people living and to all New France with the same faculties" (Arch. Propag. Acta anni 1642, Vol. XV, fol. 29v, num. 21). The country which Father Pacificus had in mind when asking Propaganda for an extension of his territory was the French West Indies. He finally went there in 1642, after Propaganda had extended the limits of his Prefecture beyond New France and beyond New England to those southern islands. Accordingly the Prefecture of Canda was extended to comprise beyond its original territory of Acadia and New England, all French possessions of the West Indies. Father Pacificus is styled thence forth *"Prefect of the Capuchin Mission of Canada and North America"* (Arch. Propag. Acta de anno 1646, Vol. XVII, fol. 91, num. 29, fol. 328, num. 20, Cesinale, op. cit., III, p. 678).

After the death of Father Pacificus of Provins the missions in the French West Indies were assigned to the Provincial of the Capuchin Province of Normandy and the jurisdiction of the Provincial of the Paris Capuchin Province was again restricted to Acadia and New England. Certainly, the Capuchins laboring in the Acadian Mission did not know the accurate extent of the whole territory, over which they had jurisdiction; the geographical notions were rather loose in those days. Nevertheless, they claimed jurisdiction as far south as Cape Cod even after the abandonment of the mission. Father Ignatius of Paris who had been laboring for eleven years in the Acadian Mission describes in his official report to Propaganda of the year 1656 the boundaries of the Prefectus as "comprising that whole district which begins on its southern extremity with Cape Malabar (or Cape Cod) and is bounded on the north by the harbor of Gaspé (cp. Records A. C. H. Soc., XXVII, 1916, p. 306).

The permanent mission posts established by the Capuchins between 1632 and 1654 stretched from Castine on the Penobscot, (Maine) to Bathurst on Chaleurs Bay, (New Brunswick), and from St. John, New Brunswick, to St. Peter's, Cape Breton. The territory, however, of their actual missionary labors extended from the Kennebec, (Maine) to the easternmost part of Cape Breton. The number of missionaries had increased in 1652 to ten priests and six brothers laboring at the same time

in that vineyard of the Lord. This number of missionaries was never reached within the next century, from 1655 to 1755, and is all the more remarkable, since the population of that territory in 1652 did not exceed from 7000 to 8000 Indians, 500 to 600 settled colonists and several hundreds of migratory fishermen who lived there only during the summer months, whereas in 1755 the number of white settlers had reached the 18000 mark, the numbers of Indians and fishermen remaining stationary.

In 1906, the Rev. Thomas J. Campbell, S. J., stated that "Acadia was in the beginning practically a Protestant colony and that for more than fifty years its inhabitants were either adherents of that faith or strongly influenced by its principles" (Messenger, Ser. VI, vol. IX, 1906, p. 229, repeated in *Pioneer Laymen*, Vol. I, 1915, p. 158). He thought that "the Acadians became sincerely Catholic only after 1656" (op. cit., p. 142). In refutation of this we point only to the detailed list of articles appropriated by the English in 1654, which the French ambassador presented to the English government for payment. (Bibliothèque Nationale Fonds Franç. Vol. 17871, fol. 190). Among other things the English had taken from the Capuchin Mission at Annapolis in 1654 no less than seven chalices, five ciboria, three monstrances, twenty-eight cruets, thirty-four albs, twenty-four cinctures, forty-eight purificators, thirty-six amices, thirty-two altar-cloths, ten corporals, six surplices, six missals, four rituals, six alter-lamps, eighty pounds of wax, and etc. These were church goods which the Capuchins were forced to leave behind on their expulsion from Nova Scotia in 1654. This proves that the Acadians were no Huguenots.

Did the Capuchins do any missionary work in New England? We must answer, that we do not know, since the documents are silent on this point. Abraham Shurt informs us in a letter addressed to John Winthrop and dated Pemaquid, June 28, 1636, that the commander of Fort Pentagoet (Castine, Me.) had sent a Capuchin with a delegation to him to Pemaquid (Lincoln Co., Me.), the "Franciscan ffryer (Capuchin from Pentagoet) insinuating unto me that Mr. Commander (of Pentagoet) desired nothing but fayre passages betwixt us, and that he was sent purposely to signify so much unto me" (Collect. Massachus. Historic. Soc., Series IV, Vol. VI. (Vol. 36), p. 571). Eight years

later, governor D'Aulnay of Acadia (or Nova Scotia) sent an emissary to Boston to conclude a treaty of peace with Massachusetts Bay who *was suspected to be a Capuchin.* William Hubbard, a contemporary who had been living in Massachusetts from 1630 to his death in 1704, writes in his *General History of New England:* "On October 3, 1644, D'Aulnay sent a vessel to Salem with ten men, amongst whom was one Monsieur Marie (supposed to be a friar, but habited like a gentleman)" (*Collect Massach. Hist. Soc.,* Ser. II, Vol. VI. (Vol. 16), p. 486). The treaty was signed at Boston on October 8th following. In September 1646, Monsieur Marie went to Boston again in company with a certain Monsieur Louis. During this second visit the agent of Governor D'Aulnay was suspected again to be a Capuchin and his companion was likewise supposed to be such (Ferland, Histoire du Canada I, p. 355). The question, whether these suspicions of the New Englanders were true, cannot be settled definitely. It is highly probable that these envoys of Governor D'Aulnay were Capuchin Friars in disguise. As it was, many people of that colony had become acquainted with Capuchins to such an extent that they could recognize them. This is especially true of the many New England merchants who carried on an extensive trade with the Catholic French settlers of Acadia. "The English merchants," Governor Bradford complained in 1650, "traded with the French and so have continued to do (from 1635) till this day. So as in truth the English themselves have been the chiefest supporters of these French; for beside these, the plantation at Pemaquid (which lies near unto them) doth not only supply them with what they want, but gives them continual intelligence of all things that passes among the English" (Bradford, *Hist. of New England,* in: *Coll. Massach. Hist. Soc.,* Ser. IV, Vol. III, (Vol. 33), p. 336 sq). Other colonists had witnessed with horror on their visit in London, how the Capuchins at the Queen's Chapel conducted services in public in the heart of the metropolis, so that the barefooted Friars had become the most talked of priests in all England. In this way the Capuchins had not been strangers to the stern Puritans. In Boston was living in 1645 Madame Mellanson, once a member of the then extinct Scotch colony at Annapolis, Nova Scotia, whose two sons remained, became converts to the Catholic Church and married Catholic girls thereby becoming

the progenitors of the now very numerous family of French Acadians bearing the name of Melançon. She left Nova Scotia shortly after the arrival of the Capuchins and French colonists in 1632. However, two Franciscan Friars of the family of Recollects landed at Boston on June 12, 1643, staying there till July the 14th following. They had come as chaplains to the colonists La Tour had brought over from France for his plantation in Nova Scotia (Hubbard, op. cit., p. 479). Yet neither the real nor suspected Franciscan Friars were dreaded by the Bostonians as much as the Jesuits. The latter were formally excluded from Massachusetts by law in 1647, whereas the former who had been living nearer their border line, were left in peace, at least on the statute-book.

Whilst the French Capuchins of Acadia held jurisdiction over New England and other parts of North America, a Flemish Capuchin tried to organize a *mission in the Dutch colony of New Netherland.* In the spring of 1647 the "Capuchin Father Seraphin of Brussels wrote to Propaganda regarding the Dutch colony on the Hudson River, setting forth the need of an organized mission in that part of North America which was settled both *by Catholics and heretics;* and he promised to give a detailed report personally, if he should be permitted to go to Rome. Cardinal Caraffa laid this matter before Propaganda in the meeting of June 3, 1647, whereupon Propaganda ruled on the same day that Father Seraphin should be requested to send a report on the conditions of New Netherland in writing to see first, whether such a permission is justified, and, if needs be, an obedience may be obtained later from the superiors of his Order" (Archiv. Propag. Acta anni 1647, Vol. XVII, fol. 411v, num. 13). Apparently the project did not mature. Nevertheless Father Seraphin must be credited with the distinction of *having made the first attempt to establish a mission among the white settlers of the present State of New York.* Father Seraphin Ruffini—De Burchgrave was born at Brussels in 1592, entered the Capuchin Order in 1610, labored from 1628 till 1633 in Holland at eight different places, for some time at Rotterdam, where he became acquainted with conditions of New Netherland. He died at Antwerp on October 1, 1661 (Necrologium Capucinor. Provinciae Flandro-Belgica. Tilburg 1897 p. 27). In 1659 the Nuncio of Cologne sent to Propaganda a

petition of Catholic traders of New Netherland asking for a priest to minister to them (Arch. Propag. Acta 1659, fol. 140). But again no priest was sent there, as it appears.

In Virginia, however, a mission was first established by the Capuchins in 1650. At the beginning of that year the Procurator General of the Capuchin Order presented to Propaganda the following petition: "The Queen of England (Queen Dowager Henrietta Mary) has begged the Provincial of the Capuchins of Paris to send missionaries to New England, called Virginia, where live more than fifty thousand people, the greater part of whom are heathen, many are English heretics and *a few are Catholics* deprived of every sort of spiritual assistance. The request of the Queen is furthermore seconded by Monsignor the Nuncio of France. Since said Provincial is willing to accept this mission, provided it pleases Your Eminences, and is ready to send suitable subjects there, among whom he mentions Father Joseph of Paris, preacher, who had been working in England for several years as missionary, and Father Joseph of Angers, preacher, the Procurator General of the same Order, therefore, has regarded it as his duty to inform this Sacred Congregation about it and to receive its orders" (Arch. Propag. Lettere antich. Vol. 260, fol. 378). The petition of the Provincial which antedates the above document reads as follows: "The Provincial of the Capuchins of the Province of Paris humbly informs Your Eminences that he was very much urged by the Queen of England to see to it that some of his missionaries are sent to New England, called Virginia, for the conversion and spiritual welfare of those people. He is willing to do that, presupposed that it pleases Your Eminences and provided that I will be granted the necessary faculties" (op. cit. fol. 379). In the meeting of Propaganda of February 21, 1650, Cardinal Brancatio reported concerning the petition of the Procurator General of the Capuchins, in which he asked the Sacred Congregation that the Provincial of Paris be granted faculties to establish a mission in New England or Virginia and to send there six Fathers as missionaries to convert the heathens. The Sacred Congregation granted the petition, provided that the Fathers are found suitable by the Nuncio of France (Archives Propag. Acta de anno 1650, Vol. XIX, fol. 330, num. 15).

It is true that the geographical designation of Virginia was sometimes taken in those days as comprising all English colonies on the Atlantic coast of America. Accordingly Father Hughes S. J. (Hist. of Society of Jesus in North Am. Vol. II. Text, p. 51) inclines to the view that the Capuchins might have been introduced into Maryland in 1650. But this is clearly a mistake. The Queen Dowager Henrietta Mary knew the difference between the province which had been named in her honor Maryland and that other province called Virginia. Besides she did not harbor just then any kind feelings towards the proprietary of Maryland Lord Baltimore who was deposed, at least on paper, by her son Charles II in February 1650, because he "visibly adhered to the rebells of England" (Neill. *Virginia Carolorum*, Albany 1886, p. 211). She could, therefore, not promote a new mission to the territory of her adversary. As a matter of fact, this missionary movement of 1650 was inaugurated by the Queen Dowager in the interest of the emigration of the Cavaliers to Virginia. Men of consideration among the nobility and gentry, struck with horror at the execution of Charles I (1649) and desiring no reconciliation with the "rebels", made their way to Virginia, where Charles the Second, a fugitive from England, was still the sovereign (G. Bancroft, *Hist. of U. St.*, I., p. 210sq). By hundreds they fled to Virginia in 1650 and later, among them some Catholic gentlemen. It was primarily for the spiritual assistance of those Catholic Cavaliers that the Queen Dowager urged the Capuchins to establish a mission in Virginia.

The Capuchin Mission, established in Virginia in 1650, was in *reality an independent Prefecture. Its Prefect Apostolic was the Provincial of the Capuchin Province of Paris* who at the same time was also Prefect Apostolic of Acadia and New England. In 1650, he addressed the following petition to Propaganda: "Friar Martial of Paris, Provincial of the Minor Friars Capuchins of the Paris Province and Prefect of the Missions, craves humbly the Sacred Congregation of Cardinals, since it is necessary for the promotion of the salvation of souls to send missionaries to Virginia or New England who have to live and mix with heretics (who number about fifty thousand(?) and savages, that these missionaries be granted the dispensation given erewhile to those laboring in England, viz. to wear civil clothes and to handle and spend money, whenever necessity

requires so; without such faculties they can absolutely not subsist in those parts" (Archiv. Propag. Lettere, Antiche, Vol. 260, fol. 380).

We do not know precisely, how long the Capuchins labored in Virginia. However, as late as the year 1689 we find mention made of a Capuchin, Alexander Plunkett, doing missionary work in Virginia (Publ. Rec. Office Calend. VIII, p. 52, 157) (Hughes, op. cit., p. 52). At all events, the *Capuchins have the distinction of having been the first missionaries as well as the first Prefects Apostolic of Virginia* which in those days compromised the whole territory southwards to the Spanish colony of Florida.

In 1671 the Nuncio of France forwarded from Paris an ample plan for the evangelization of "Florida of the North." A person of quality in Paris, he states, would defray all the expenses, but proposes that Capuchins were to be sent there as missionaries. From this base of operation, the Capuchin missionaries could penetrate "into divers countries of America, Tartary, islands of Asia and Australian land." The Propaganda approved this new mission on April 27, 1671 (Archiv. Propag. Acta de anno 1671, fol. 137v, num 29). "Where this mission was to be," writes Father Hughes (Hist. of Soc. of Jesus in North Am., Vol. II, Text, p. 51), "it is beyond all our geographical acquirements to ascertain." This Florida del Nort was located nowhere else than at the Hudson Bay and, therefore, this mission does not concern us here. The discoverer Laurens Van Hemcherck describes at some length this country named by him Florida of the North as *"lands discovered above Canada"* (Archiv. Nation. of Paris, Colonies Series B. Vol. 2, fol. 65b). He was convinced that he had found the northwest passage through Canada to Asia, so that the Capuchins could cross from there over to "Tartary and South-sea Islands." Even as late as the 18th century, explorers were still searching for such a passage.

The documents which are here published for the first time open a new vista in the grand panorama of the missionary activity of the church. The Roman authorities who labored hard to restore in Europe Catholicism in the countries overrun by Protestantism, did not lose sight of the emigrants settled on the distant shores of North America; so that the movements of the Puritans in New England are reported as currently in the correspondence of Propaganda as the persecutions and vexations

of Anglicans and Puritans in Great Britain, of Huguenots in France, of Calvinists and Lutherans in Germany and Scandinavia. The ministration of the few Catholic settlers and the conversion of the Indian tribes were regarded as different means to that end—the conversions of heretics in the English colonies. It was not the fault of the Cardinals directing the work at Rome that their expectations were not realized. They had chosen the best means available, namely *to send French and English missionaries who were placed under the then most powerful French protectorate.* The ascendancy of France at the English court was just then at its height, the Queen herself being a French princess. Though the net results of missionary activity had been even more disappointing in New England than in the British Isle, yet Propaganda deserves credit for having attempted what proved to be a failure. The two Prefectures Apostolic of New England and Virginia should convince historians that it is a mistake to trace the present hierarchy in those states back to the Indian Missions scattered along the Atlantic coast.

JOHN M. LENHART, O.M. CAP.,
Capuchin College,
Washington, D. C.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL STATUS OF NEW MEXICO. 1680-1875.

The history of the Catholic Church in New Mexico in the early period of its development cannot be understood without a knowledge of the character and customs of the Spanish people, who in the person of Conquistadores and accompanying missionaries, first brought the faith to this country.

In the eight centuries of almost ceaseless fighting, which it had required to win back their country from the Moors, the Spaniards had developed qualities of bravery, loyalty and a fierce devotedness to their religion, with the result that in the sixteenth century, Religion and Patriotism were in their minds almost synonymous terms. When, a short time after the fall of Granada, the Spanish warriors, with undaunted enthusiasm, crossed the Atlantic and continued the work of conquest, they considered the introduction of Spanish rule as preliminary to the introduction of the Catholic religion.[1]

However, the relations of Church and State in Spain were far from being ideal. The state protected the church, but through the preceding centuries little by little through usurpation, through custom, and through Papal concession, the state had secured power which came dangerously near making the church in Spain independent of Rome. In uniting the many scattered districts of the Spanish peninsula, the king had gradually acquired an almost absolute power. And where religion and nationality were so closely bound together as in Spain, it was almost inevitable that the overweening power of the ruler in secular affairs, should be extended until it interfered in ecclesiastical matters.[2]

How far it was extended in this field, will best be shown by enumerating some of the powers which the ruler of Spain exercised over the Church in Spanish America. By the Bull, *Universalis Ecclesiæ Regimini*, Pope Julius II, in 1508, conceded that no churches, monasteries, or religious foundations could be erected in territory already discovered, or that should be subse-

1 RYAN, EDWIN, "Diocesan Organization in the Spanish Colonies," *Catholic Historical Review*, Vol. II, p. 148.

2 *Ibid.*, p. 149.

quently discovered, without the consent of the Spanish monarch. Further, the ruler had the power of nominating suitable candidates for the metropolitan or other sees, even future ones, and he also exercised the right of presenting candidates for every ecclesiastical benefice, large or small.[3] Religious establishments were under the supervision of the Council of the Indes. This led to the establishment of the office of the Commissioner General. Provincials of Regulars were nominated by their General, but the nomination could be suspended by the Commissioner General and the Council of the Indes.[4]

"The Council of the Indes was organized in 1524. This body was the supreme legislative and judicial authority, under the king, of Spanish America. The Casa de Contratacion was subordinate to the Council, which likewise supervised all civil and ecclesiastical appointments in the colonies."[5]

The Council of the Indes even regulated the journeys of Religious. All Bulls and Briefs had to go through their hands, and without their seal no use could be made of them.[6] By royal decree, in 1564, it was further stipulated that if a Religious wished to leave the Indes and return to Spain, not even a decree of the pope would permit this, without the permission of the Council of the Indes.[7]

Furthermore, Pope Alexander VI conferred the tithes of all the Indes on the king, on condition that he would endow the churches and provide an adequate maintenance for their ministers. In justice to the kings, it must be said that they seldom made use of the tithes granted to them, but donated to bishops, hospitals, etc., a great part of what was due to them from this source. Considering the number of monasteries, hospitals, churches, etc., built in New Spain, it will be seen that the king was generous and used his means for the spread of religion. In the beginning, at least, he also made a wise selection of the men he sent to Spanish America, and it was his custom to defray all

3 *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. X, p. 260.

4 *Ibid.*, Vol. X, p. 260.

5 BOLTON, H. E. and MARSHALL, T. M., *The Colonization of N. America*, p. 19-20.

6 *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. X, p. 261.

7 *Ibid.*, Vol. X, p. 261.

expenses of bishops and Religious until their destination was reached.[8]

The king exercised his power in the American colonies chiefly through the Viceroy, who was appointed by the ruler, on the advice of the Council of the Indes. The viceroy personally represented the king in all branches of government, and served as civil head of the Church, with the title of vice-patron. The relations of Church and State had been settled in Spain during the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella, and had been settled to the advantage of the State.[9] "The relative positions of King and Pope in Europe had been carried to America by their respective representatives the viceroy and the archbishop. Thus it was that the rights of patronage which belonged to the king in Spain came to be connected naturally enough with the viceroy in New Spain."[10]

This right of patronage is responsible for many of the evils which developed later, but on the other hand, history furnishes numerous instances of true zeal on the part of the Spanish ruler, for the spread of the Catholic religion, and the best interests of the Indians. In 1523, the King of Spain, by *Real Cedula*, commanded De Ayllon to take proper religious persons with him on his proposed voyage to settle the eastern coast of North America, providing that all expenses in transporting and maintaining the missionaries should be paid from the royal profits.[11] Likewise, in 1755, Ferdinand VI instructed his recent appointee as Viceroy of New Spain, to give the Religious all the support which they needed to protect the Indians, and to see that they were properly instructed.[12]

The survivors of the ill-fated expedition of Narvaez, which had left Spain in 1528, after years of weary wandering, arrived at Culiacan, Sinaloa, in 1536, and gave such glowing accounts of the country to the north, that Mendoza, Viceroy of Mexico, became interested and ordered an expedition to obtain possession of the land. The preparations were delayed, and meanwhile Mendoza ordered Fray Marcos de Niza to make a preliminary ex-

8 *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. X, p. 261.

9 SMITH, DON, "The Viceroy of New Spain," *Report of American Historical Association*, Vol. I (1918), p. 174.

10 *Ibid.*, p. 174.

11 SHEA, J. G., *The Catholic Church in Colonial Days*, p. 105-106.

12 *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. X, p. 262.

ploration. The Franciscan started in 1539, accompanied by the negro survivor of the Narvaez expedition and some Indians. After many hardships, they reached the pueblo of Zuñi. Here a cross was erected, and the priest took possession of the kingdom for Spain, and gave the territory a name, "The New Kingdom of St. Francis."[13]

The land to which Father Mark laid claim by his explorations was a country of mountain, plateau, and valley, extending eastward to and beyond the Rio Grande river. This region, which today we call New Mexico, is, broadly speaking, a tableland, broken by parallel ranges of mountains.[14] The soil in the valleys is rich sandy loam, producing good crops if irrigated. Valuable timber is plentiful in the western and central districts. Rich deposits of gold, silver, and copper are found, as well as, an abundance of coal in some districts. The climate is uniform, the dry atmosphere tending to render the heat less oppressive.[15]

The Indians of this section were a people distinct from the wild savages who surrounded them. The Spaniards found them living in villages, some of which still exist. The origin of these Pueblo Indians is a disputed question. Some ethnologists claim they were originally a branch of the Aztecs, others say they are of Toltec origin. According to their own tradition, they came to New Mexico from the north.[16]

The Pueblo Indians of New Mexico comprise the Tanoan, Keresan (Queres) and Zunian linguistic families,[17] and their chief habitat was the Rio Grande basin between 34° and 37° N. Lat.. They were agriculturists, and built permanent houses, but they were easily induced to move and change their habitation. The great number of ruins is no indication of a great population, for one hundred Pueblo Indians were capable of building twenty-five pueblos in a century.[18] If anything happened to the water supply, the tribe moved, if enemies sacked the pueblo, another one was built, but rarely in the same locality.

---

13 *Ibid.*, Vol. XI, p. 1.

14 *Encyclopedia Britannica*, "New Mexico," Vol. XIX-XX, p. 520.

15 *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. XI, p. 1.

16 DEFOURI, J. H., *Historical Sketch of the Catholic Church in N. Mexico*, p. 18.

17 *Handbook of American Indians; Bureau of American Ethnology*, Bulletin 30, Part II, p. 318.

18 TWITCHELL, R. E., *Spanish Archives of New Mexico*, Vol. I, p. 460.

The natives used available material for their homes. In northern New Mexico, sandstone and blocks of lava or tufa were used, while the Indians of the southern district used abobe or bricks made of mud and dried in the sun. The pueblos were constructed with a view to safety. To enter the house it was necessary to climb a ladder to the second story and descend to the first floor through an inside opening. In case of an attack, the Indians mounted to the second story and drew the ladders after them. Each pueblo had one or more kivas or estufas. A kiva was a secret ceremonial chamber, usually circular in shape and partly above and partly below the ground.[19]

The Pueblos had a system of irrigation, crude indeed, yet it sufficed to make possible the cultivation of a species of corn, beans, and cotton. They had devised a system of weaving, and the cloth served both for apparel and barter. Real skill was shown in pottery and basket making. The men were hunters but not fierce warriors, and savage Navajos and Apaches from the surrounding country frequently raided the Pueblo districts. At the time of the Spanish conquest, there were some seventy inhabited pueblos, whose population may have been from 30,000 to 60,000.[20] These Indians were intensely religious. Their life was one succession of religious acts and rites, as every phase of it was connected with some religious ceremony.[21] No undertaking of any importance was begun without making an offering of harina (corn meal) to some symbolic object, e. g. a scalp lock, or a rabbit head, suspended on a pole. The objects themselves were not reverenced, but were only a part of the ceremony. Each tribe had many sorcerers, and the opposition between warriors and sorcerers, the two main divisions, caused many civil wars, so that at times whole pueblos were laid waste.[22]

When Father Mark returned to Mexico, he reported that the district he had visited was larger and gave greater promise than Mexico. This report was the signal for many ambitious Spaniards to seek the sole right to explore the land. Cortés, Guzman,

19 SCHUSTER, FRIDOLIN, "Pueblo Indians," *Indian Sentinel*, October, 1918, p. 15.

20 BOLTON, H. E. and MARSHALL, T. M., *The Colonization of N. America*, p. 46.

21 SCHUSTER, FRIDOLIN, *op. cit.*, p. 15.

22 BENAVIDES, *Memorial*, p. 31.

and the agents of De Soto were among the number of the contestants, but the royal council decided that the exploration should be made in behalf of the Crown. The Viceroy named Coronado, governor of Nueva Galicia, commander of the expedition, and in 1540, a well-equipped body composed of some two hundred seventy soldiers and nearly one thousand Indians and servants, left Compostela. An ample food supply was provided as large droves of cattle, sheep, goats, and swine, were driven ahead. The country through which Coronado passed did not come up to the expectations of the Spaniards, and the expedition accomplished nothing in a material way except to make important explorations which extended even into the present state of Kansas,[23] or Nebraska.[24] Four Franciscan missionaries accompanied Coronado,[25] and three remained with the Indians. Fray Marcos de Niza served as Coronado's guide as far as Cibola, then returned to Mexico.[26] Fray Juan de Padilla went beyond the limits of the Pueblo region, to Quivira, and worked zealously for the conversion of the Indians until he was murdered by them in 1544.[27] Fray Juan de la Cruz remained at Tiguex, near the present Bernalillo, New Mexico, where he was killed in 1542.[28] Fray Luis Descalona, a lay brother, established himself at Pecos, and was likewise murdered by the Indians.[29]

After the murder of the missionaries who had remained among the Indians, no further efforts were made until 1581, when two priests, Father Francis Lopez and Father John of St. Mary, accompanied Brother Augustine Rodriguez to New Mexico. All three met their deaths at the hands of the red men.[30] Despite these tragedies, or perhaps led on by them, the Spanish interest in the country to the north was unabated. Don Antonio Espejo, accompanied by Fray Beltran and fourteen soldiers made extensive explorations in the Pueblo region in 1582-3, but

23 BOLTON, H. E. and MARSHALL, T. M., *op. cit.*, pp. 44-45.

24 SHINE, M. A., "The Lost Province of Quivira," *Catholic Historical Review*, Vol. II, p. 15.

25 BENAVIDES, *Memorial*, p. 180-181.

26 BENAVIDES, *Memorial*, notes, p. 285.

27 *Ibid.*, p. 195.

28 *Ibid.*, p. 195.

29 *Ibid.*, p. 232.

30 SHEA, J. G., *op. cit.*, pp. 183-185.

all returned to Mexico.[31] The king wished the conquest and colonization to be made under contract and finally Juan de Oñate was selected as the successful applicant. He was made governor, adelantado, and captain-general, with extensive privileges which his colonists shared. In 1598, three years after the contract was signed, the colony left Mexico. It consisted of Oñate, a band of Franciscans under Father Martinez, and one hundred and thirty soldiers, some accompanied by their families. The Indians were terrified and overawed by the well armed soldiers, and acknowledged the authority of Oñate without any serious resistance. The first settlement was made in the valley of Santo Domingo, and called Real de San Juan. Here, the first church was erected, Father Martinez blessing it and consecrating the altars and chalices.[32]

With a religious center thus established, the Pueblo country was divided into districts and a priest assigned to each division. Each pueblo received the name of a mystery or a saint to which the church or convent was to be dedicated. In the spring, Oñate abandoned the first settlement and established San Gabriel. While he, his officers, and two Franciscans, were absent on an exploring tour, the colonists deserted San Gabriel and started to return to Mexico. On Oñate's return, he sentenced the deserting men to death, but as the missionaries justified their action, the commander relented, and the colonists returned to the settlement.[33] From this time until the revolt in 1680, the Spaniards retained their control of New Mexico. Early in the seventeenth century Santa Fé was founded and made the seat of the government, but the first years were not prosperous. In 1617, a petition was sent to the king who directed his viceroy to give aid to the struggling colonists.[34]

We learn from the *Memorial* which Fray Alonso de Benavides prepared for the king of Spain in 1630, that New Mexico was at that time in a flourishing condition. Santa Fé was the only Spanish town, and was supported by tribute from the Pueblos. The Indians were required to pay for each house one

31 Bancroft, H. H., *History of Arizona and N. Mexico*, Vol. XVII, pp. 78-90.
32 Shea, J. G., *The Catholic Church in Colonial Days*, p. 189.
33 Shea, J. G., *op. cit.*, p. 193.
34 Shea, J. G., *The Catholic Church in Colonial Days*, p. 193.

manta (33 in.) of cotton cloth and one fanega (between 1.6 and 2.5 bu.) of corn each year. This system of encomiendas had been introduced by Oñate, and at that time was considered inherent in the privilege of conquest. In this arrangement, the conquered natives were parceled out to individual Spaniards, who often exercised their authority through native chiefs, making them responsible for good order and the collection of tribute. In return for his privileges, the encomendero was required to teach and Christianize his Indians at his own expense.[35]

In many instances, there were grave abuses connected with this system which was found in all parts of the Spanish-American colonies and it was the wretched condition of the Indians of the West Indies which aroused the sympathy of Las Casas, who with Cardinal Ximenes, must be credited with inaugurating the movement for the abolishment of the evils. Encomiendas disappeared in New Mexico in the first half of the seventeenth century, and with their disappearance, the missionaries found greater opportunities to exercise their zeal for the welfare of the Indians.

The Fathers of the Franciscan Order, to whom the glory of having first brought the knowledge of the Christian religion to New Mexico, is justly due, made their entrance with the first band of Spanish explorers, and were found at their post until prescribed by a misguided government. When one group of missionaries was murdered by their charges another band, undeterred by the like fate which threatened them, came forward to take up the work. The Spanish government realized that the missionaries were most valuable allies in the conquest of the Indians, and aided in the establishment of the missions, although at a later period, both priests and missions were sadly neglected.

The aim of the Franciscans was to make good Christians of the Pueblos. This involved teaching them the rudiments of civilized life. To accomplish this as soon as possible, schools were established in which the priests taught not only Christian doctrine, but also the elementary branches of secular learning. At the same time, they trained the most promising pupils to become teachers. It is probable that in the course of time, the natives did most of the teaching, but at first the Fathers had to

35 BENAVIDES, *Memorial*, note, p. 234-235.

bear the whole burden themselves.[36] In Father Benavides' *Memorial*, dated 1630, he gives an account of the schools attached to the various Pueblos, where "the Religious besides the teaching and indoctrination of our Holy Catholic Faith, teach to sing, read and write and all the trades and to live in civilized fashion in their schools."[37]

In obedience to instructions, the Fathers taught the Indians the Spanish language, while at the same time they endeavored to become acquainted with the various Pueblo dialects. Father Geronimo de Zarate Salmeron's catechism in the Jemez language, which was written between 1617 and 1625,[38] is a proof of great industry, while the same Father's record of having baptized 6,500 Jemez Indians stands as a silent witness of missionary zeal. The work of making the bricks, and building the monasteries and churches devolved upon the missionaries, who were aided by the women and children as the men disdained such work. In Father Benavides' time over fifty churches with very curious carved roof and well painted walls, had been erected.[39]

It is difficult to realize all the hardships to which these missionaries were subjected. The Indian food was distasteful, the traveling was done on foot and the way was rough, death from thirst was ever threatening, the water when found was often poisonous, the Indians were repulsive and known to be treacherous:—yet all this was willingly and cheerfully endured that Christ's message might be preached and souls saved.

These Religious were sent to New Mexico from the Province of the Holy Evangel, but practically all of the early missionaries were Spaniards by birth. They had the double task of ministering to the Spanish soldiers and converting the Indians, and enjoyed the usual privileges of Spanish American missionaries. In 1522, Pope Adrian VI had granted to the American Franciscans the right to elect their own superior, who would enjoy the full authority of the Minister General, having episcopal jurisdiction over the houses of his Order, and the right to exercise all epis-

36 BURNS, J. A., "Early Mission Schools of the Franciscans," *Catholic University Bulletin*, Vol. XIII, p. 28.

37 BENAVIDES, *Memorial*, p. 99.

38 *Ibid.*, notes, p. 200.

39 BENAVIDES, *Memorial*, p. 33.

copal functions except Ordination. The individual friars were empowered to exercise papal authority when they considered it necessary for the conversion of the Indians. These privileges might be used if no bishop could be reached without a journey of two days.[40] Pope Paul III, in 1535, confirmed and extended these privileges, making the Friars in Spanish America almost independent of Episcopal jurisdiction.[41] In 1567 Pope Pius V had declared the Franciscan Friars to possess all the powers of parish priests for the Indians, and for the whites of their district, who were not subject to parish priest.[42]

In 1621 or 1622, at a Provincial Chapter of Franciscans held in Mexico the Missions of New Mexico hitherto under the care of a Commissary, were formed into the Custodia de la Conversion de San Pablo,[43] and Fray Alonso de Benavides was selected as first Custos or Custodio. The Spanish viceroy authorized him to take to New Mexico, twenty-six missionaries, their expenses being paid by the Spanish king.[44] These laborers were supplemented by the addition of nineteen priests and two lay brothers in 1628. At that time Father Stephen Perea was appointed Custodio, replacing Father Benavides who visited Spain to give an account of the Franciscan labors in New Mexico, and to petition the king for the erection of a bishopric in that section. A few years before, in 1620, Pope Paul V had erected the See of Durango, and New Mexico was included in its territory[45] but no bishop visited the Pueblo district before the revolt of 1680.

Father Benavides tells us that the Spaniards held the Indians in fear by inflicting rigorous punishment when a Pueblo revolted.[46] Necessity seemed to them to demand this policy, otherwise the Indians would have taken advantage of the opportunity offered, and would have exterminated the foreigners. Despite the harsh treatment accorded, attempts at revolt were not infrequent.

---

40 RYAN, EDWIN, "Diocesan Organization in the Spanish Colonies," *Catholic Historical Review*, Vol. IV, pp. 171-172.

41 *Ibid.*, Vol. IV, pp. 171-172.

42 Cited by SHEA in *Catholic Church in Colonial Days*, p. 213.

43 BENAVIDES, *Memorial*, notes, p. 188.

44 SHEA, J. G., *op. cit.*, p. 195.

45 RYAN, EDWIN, *Catholic Historical Review*, Vol. V, p. 5.

46 BENAVIDES, *Memorial*, p. 22.

Between 1640 and 1650, difficulties arose between the governor and the Religious, and these disagreements had no slight effect on the Indians. The authority of the Friars was lessened and their control of the Pueblos declined. The Indians grew restless and dissatisfied. In 1650 five of the Teguas nations entered into a league to destroy the Spaniards, planning to make a sudden attack on Holy Thursday, while the white men were attending religious services. The plot was discovered, and the Indians were severely punished: nine of the leaders were hanged, and many others sold into slavery.[47] Again in 1675, the Teguas Indians were subjected to severe treatment, a number of their tribe being whipped and sold as slaves. On this occasion, seventy Pueblos led by Popé from San Juan, went to the governor and demanded the release of the Teguas still detained in prison. The intimidated governor released the prisoners, but stipulated that the Indians should give up their superstitious practices.[48] This promise was readily made, but by no means kept.

In 1678, Fray Francisco de Ayeta, Visitor of the Province of the Holy Evangel of New Mexico,[49] called attention in his report, to the defenceless condition of the New Mexican colony, and to the disturbed condition of the Indians. No action was taken and the revolt of 1680 was the result.

II.

REVOLT-RECONQUEST. 1680-1700.

The resentment of the Indians against their conquerors grew stronger with each conflict between the races, and culminated in the desperate attempt of the Pueblos to destroy the hated Spaniards by a wholesale massacre. The acknowledged leader in the conspiracy was Poc-Pec or Popé, a Teguas Indian, native of San Juan.[1] His chief assistants were Alonzo Catití from Santo Domingo, and Luis Tupatu from Picuriés.[2]

47 Defouri, J. H., "Santa Fé in the Past," *Catholic World* (1883), Vol. XXXVII, p. 567.

48 *Ibid.*, p. 568.

49 *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. II, p. 164.

1 *Spanish Archives of New Mexico*, Vol. I, p. 459.

2 *Ibid.*, p. 459.

Popé had been very active against the Spaniards for many years and it is probable that he had been severely dealt with by the authorities. He was both feared and admired by the Indians who believed that he had formed an alliance with *El Demonio* of the Spaniards, and that he could do them all the harm he wished. Taos, the most northern of the pueblos, was the headquarters of the conspirators, and from this center, Popé personally, or through trusted agents, secured the cooperation of all the pueblos except the Piros in the south.[3] These, known to be friends of the Spaniards, were not invited to take part.

In persuading the Indians to join in the revolt, the instigators dwelt on the hardships endured by the Pueblos since the coming of the foreigners, alleging that everything ordered by the Spaniards had but one purpose, to increase the slavery of the natives.[4] They emphasized the ill treatment received from the Spanish military commanders, under whom they claimed they had been beaten, robbed, and made to work without pay,[5] and they blamed the Religious for causing their idols to be destroyed, their medicine men to be punished, and for the prohibition of their dances and superstitious practices.[6] The leading Pueblos joined in threatening with destruction any pueblo or individual Indian that did not join in the uprising, while liberty to return to their former customs and religious practices, as well as specified promises of reward were made to those active in the massacre. If an Indian killed one Spaniard he might have one wife, if he killed four Spaniards, four wives, etc..[7]

When all the plans had been completed, runners were sent to the different pueblos, to announce the exact time appointed for the uprising. A knotted cord of blue flannel was sent as a calendar, the knots signifying the number of days which were to elapse before the massacre should take place.[8] Every means was used to preserve secrecy. Popé murdered his son-in-law, the Indian governor of San Juan, just previous to the revolt, fearing that he would betray the plot. But despite all the cunning

3 BANCROFT, H. H., *History of Arizona and New Mexico*, Vol. XVII, p. 175.
4 *Spanish Archives of New Mexico*, Vol. II, p. 269-270.
5 *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 57.
6 *Spanish Archives of New Mexico*, Vol. II, p. 20.
7 *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 16-18.
8 *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 63.

and cruelty manifested on the part of the leaders, in several places the plan was revealed to the friars. Whether they realized the seriousness of the situation is not known, but Popé saw that immediate action was necessary, and gave orders to the Taos, Picuriés, and Tehuas Indians to make the attack before dawn on August 10.[9]

The command was obeyed, no missionary, no Spaniard of whatever rank, was spared in that section. The other Pueblos made the attack as soon as the word was received, but south of San Felipe (one of the southern pueblos of the Queres nation) all were warned in time to escape.[10] The number of victims was slightly over four hundred. This included twenty-one missionaries: the Father Custodio, eighteen priests, and two lay brothers; and more than three hundred and eighty other Spaniards. The Religious were killed with seeming demoniacal cruelty, the churches were desecrated, and the sacerdotal vestments used in mockery in their idolatrous Indian dances.[11] Monasteries and ranch homes were alike demolished, and the destroyers took possession of all the live stock and anything they thought worth preserving.

At Santa Fé, the residence of Governor Otermin, in whose administration the revolt took place, the attack was not made until August 15. The few Spaniards surviving the destruction in the outlying districts had taken refuge there, and many of the Indians after completing the massacre at their own pueblo, joined the attacking band at Santa Fé. The siege lasted five days, during which the besiegers, 3,000 strong, forced the Spaniards and their Tlascalan allies, back into the plaza and old palace. The church and convent were burned and the water supply cut off by the Indians.[12] Encouraged by the three Franciscans, the Spaniards faced the insurgents, and in a desperate attack killed more than three hundred of their number. The Indians withdrew to the surrounding hills, awaiting reinforcements and the Spaniards took advantage of their confusion and left Santa Fé. The Pueblos watched the procession leave the city, but made no effort to attack, as the refugees moved southward through a

9 BANCROFT, H. H., *op. cit.*, pp. 176-177.
10 *Ibid.*, Vol. XVII, p. 179.
11 *Spanish Archives of New Mexico*, Vol. II, pp. 43-44.
12 BANCROFT, H. H., *op. cit.*, Vol. XVII, p. 183.

deserted and stricken country. Another band of Spaniards, in which there were seven Religious, joined them in their retreat and together they took up fortified positions at La Salienta and San Lorenzo. Here, Father Ayeta, Procurator of the kingdom, met them with much needed supplies.[13]

The entire band finally encamped at the mission of Guadalupe, near El Paso del Norte. Before reaching this spot a "junta de guerra" was held on the question of an attempt to return to Santa Fé. Father Ayeta represented the Religious and made offers of assistance in the way of provisions, but after discussion the governor decided against the attempt.[14] Some of the arguments adduced against an immediate return were: the apostate rebels were numerous, very cunning, well equipped and thoroughly familiar with the territory of New Mexico; while the Spaniards were few in number, utterly disheartened, and almost without equipment and provisions for the coming winter.[15]

As it was, most of the 2,500 survivors of the massacre, would probably have perished at El Paso had it not been for the assistance rendered by Father Ayeta. He not only brought supplies with him, but made arrangements for sending to Casas Grandes and to Tarmarares for a supply of corn and livestock.[16] Later he went to Mexico and endeavored to persuade the authorities to undertake the reconquest at once. This was considered inadvisable, but the viceroy ordered provisions made for the families of the Spanish refugees, and for the Indians who accompanied the white men. This led to the establishment of El Paso, under the invocation of Nuestra Señora del Pilar and of San José, as a home for the Spaniards, while the Indians were provided with homes at Senecú, Isleta, and Socorro (Texas).[17]

When the rebellious Indians secured possession of Santa Fé, there was a period of wild revelry. Popé in full command, issued orders that all Christian customs and practices should be abandoned under pain of death. He proclaimed the Christian God dead, and ordered the native gods to be invoked.[18] In ful-

13 SHEA, J. G., *The Catholic Church in Colonial Days*, pp. 206-207.
14 *Spanish Archives of New Mexico*, Vol. II, pp. 1-2.
15 *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 46.
16 *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 42.
17 SALPOINTE, J. B., *Soldiers of the Cross*, p. 70.
18 BANCROFT, H. H., *op. cit.*, Vol. XVII, p. 184.

fillment of his commands the Indians offered seeds, flour, and tobacco to their idols, at the four corners and center of the Plaza, and bathed in the river in an effort to remove baptism. Every Indian married by a Christian ceremony was told to dismiss his wife and to take others, according to the former rites of the Pueblos.[19]

Popé traveled from pueblo to pueblo, exacting all the honors formerly given to the Spanish governor, and scattering corn meal upon the people as a token of his benediction. All this was acceptable during the excitement produced by the revolt, but the Indians soon realized that they had recognized a cruel master, as he did not hesitate to inflict the death penalty in order to retain his authority. Inter-tribal wars raged among the conquerors of Santa Fé: the Taos, Queres, and Pecos waged war against the Tanos and Tewas,[20] while the Utes and other wild tribes ravaged the country. No crops were planted, the supplies stolen from the Spaniards were soon exhausted, and a severe drought added to the general misery. The wizards were consulted and they advised that a human sacrifice be made to the devil. A young girl was the victim, and the offering was made with elaborate Indian ceremonies. Soon after, the drought was broken and the Rio Grande again watered the land. These circumstances confirmed the Pueblos in their apostasy and devil worship.[21]

Time brought no improvement. Frequent epidemics claimed a great number of victims, while many hapless survivors fled from the Rio Grande district to the Hopi country[22] in northeastern Arizona, and "barbarism darker than the aboriginal times settled upon the land."[23]

In the meantime, the Franciscans at El Paso, impatiently awaited an opportunity to return to their misguided and ungrateful Indians. At the urgings of Father Ayeta, the Viceroy ordered Governor Otermin to attempt an entrance into New Mexico. Accordingly a few soldiers were sent from Mexico and with

19 *Spanish Archives of New Mexico*, Vol. II, p. 57.
20 BENAVIDES, *Memorial*, notes, p. 248.
21 SALPOINTE, J. B., *op. cit.*, p. 68.
22 BENAVIDES, *Memorial*, notes, p. 259.
23 BANCROFT, H. H., *op. cit.*, Vol. XVII, p. 185.

these, the governor and missionaries, Father Ayeta among the number, left El Paso in November, 1681.

They reached Isleta, December seventh, and conquered the Indians of that place, afterwards Otermin, or detachments from his party, visited Cochití, Sandía, and Alamedia, but nothing of any consequence was accomplished. The severity of the winter prevented further advance and the party, accompanied by nearly four hundred Indians returned to El Paso.[24] The Indians were assigned homes in the vicinity, but most of them soon returned to the Pueblo country.

For a number of years the Spaniards made no attempt to regain their lost territory. In the interim, the Franciscans labored zealously among the Texas Indians. In 1683, in response to a request from the Jumanos, Father Lopez, vice-custodio, and two companions, accompanied the Indian messenger to La Junta, at the junction of the Conchos and Rio Grande rivers. Father Acevedo remained here, while the other missionaries and a small escort journeyed eastward to another band of Jumanos living near the junction of the Concho and Colorado rivers. Their labors were well repaid for many Indians were converted.[25] Father Lopez was quite a skillful linguist and soon was able to speak to the tribe in their own tongue, and as an aid to future missionaries, he drew up an extensive vocabulary of their dialect.[26]

A quarrel between the captain of the escort and members of his band who were not soldiers but volunteer citizens, hindered the work of the Religious. Father Lopez returned to El Paso and subsequently proceeded to Mexico in an effort to establish permanent missions among the Jumanos. Father Acevedo and Father Zavaleta remained at La Junta, but in a few months the Indians, in revenge for the hanging of two of their tribe at Parral, whipped the missionaries and drove them from their settlement. After many hardships the exiled missionaries finally reached El Paso.[27]

Soon after this the Spanish withdrew from Texas, and in 1716 when they attempted to regain their authority, the Jumanos

24 *Spanish Archives of New Mexico*, Vol. II, pp. 273-275.

25 BENAVIDES, *Memorial*, notes, p. 273.

26 SHEA, J. G., *op. cit.*, p. 212.

27 *Spanish Archives of New Mexico*, Vol. II, pp. 275-276.

were allied to the Apaches, proverbial enemies of the Spaniards, and this alliance precluded any attempt to renew missionary activities among them.[28]

Ten years passed and still the Spanish former inhabitants of the Pueblo country were living at El Paso. A few half-hearted attempts to regain their former homes had been made in the decade of years, but with no noteworthy results. Wearied with waiting, and disheartened at future prospects, the refugees in the summer of 1692, petitioned for permission to colonize a part of what is now Chihuahua, but the permission was not granted.[29]

The request was not without results, however, for in a short time the Spanish viceroy, Conde de Galvez, sent Don Diego de Vargas to attempt a reconquest of New Mexico. De Vargas commanded a force of sixty soldiers and one hundred Indians, and was accompanied by three Franciscan friars. The party set out from El Paso August 21, 1692, and marched northward toward Santa Fé. No unusual difficulties were encountered in the journey and the former capital was reached in September. The Tanos had been victorious in the inter-tribal warfare and at that time were occupying the former provincial buildings. They were at first defiant, but after hearing the offers of pardon made by the Religious, they acknowledged allegiance to the Spaniards. The following day the friars said Mass in the Plaza, spoke to the Indians, explaining their duties, and absolved them from their apostasy.[30] The Fathers then baptized the children born during the period of revolt. The baptisms in Santa Fé alone, numbered 969.[31]

Popé and Catití were dead, but Luis Tupatu was living and was recognized as chief by one faction of the Pueblos. He submitted to Vargas and offered his aid in conquering the Pueblos who had opposed his rule. In his company, Vargas, the missionaries, and soldiers, visited all the pueblos of the north, and received the submission of each, but the acknowledgment was made with varying sentiments and intentions. At each pueblo the Fathers absolved the Indians and baptized the children. At

28 Benavides, *Memorial*, notes, pp. 273-274.

29 *Spanish Archives of New Mexico*, Vol. II, pp. 81-82.

30 Bancroft, H. H., *op. cit.*, Vol. XVII, pp. 198-199.

31 Shea, J. G., *op. cit.*, p. 511.

Zuñi, a number of sacred vessels, pictures and books were found carefully preserved, but these were the only relics of the martyred missionaries found in the entire section.[32]

General Vargas, with his party, returned to El Paso in December, 1692,[33] and reported that he had secured the allegiance of all the pueblos, while the missionaries rejoiced in the knowledge that more than 2,200[34] children had been made "children of God and heirs of heaven."

During the following year preparations were made for the return of the former settlers. In October, 1693, Governor Vargas conducted a party composed of seventy families, over the road which he had traveled the previous year. The presence of women and children, and the conveying of the equipment necessary in the reestablishment of homes, impeded the progress of the party to such an extent that thirty persons died before Santa Fé was reached. Seventeen Franciscans under the Custodio, Fray Salvador de San Antonio, were members of the party.[35]

The Spaniards reached their destination December 16, 1693. In the ceremony conducted soon after their arrival, Governor Vargas, bearing the banner which Oñate first unfurled in New Mexico, walked behind the Religious, in a procession which moved toward a cross previously erected in the center of the plaza. Those forming the procession grouped themselves around the cross and recited the litany of the Blessed Virgin, and sang the Te Deum, Governor Vargas then officially gave possession of the missions to Father Antonio, the Custos, who responded in the name of his Order.[36]

As the Indians occupied all the available buildings in Santa Fé, the Spaniards established their camp on the side of Mount Tezuque. The winter was quite severe and several children died. The settlers were dissatisfied and became insistent that the Tanos should be compelled to return to their old pueblo of Galisteo, and relinquish the buildings in Santa Fé to the Spaniards. Governor Vargas, loath to arouse the enmity of the Indians, hesitated, but at length ordered the Tanos to leave. They refused, closed the

32 *Ibid.*, pp. 511-513.
33 *Spanish Archives of New Mexico*, Vol. II, p. 85.
34 BANCROFT, H. H., *op. cit.*, Vol. XVII, pp. 199-200.
35 *Spanish Archives of New Mexico*, Vol. II, p. 85.
36 *Ibid.*, p. 107.

gates of the town and defied the Spaniards.[37] Prompt action was necessary to quell the revolt before Indian reinforcements could arrive. On the following morning, the soldiers assisted at Mass, Governor Vargas raised the banner of Our Lady of Refuge, and the attack was made. The fighting was desperate, but after twenty-four hours the Tanos surrendered. Conditions were critical in New Mexico at this point. The governor had, before the defiance, placed great confidence in the Indians although he had been warned that they were planning to exterminate the white men, but he judged that severe measures were necessary in order to prevent another massacre. Accordingly he ordered the chief Bolsa, and the other Indians taken in arms to be shot. The missionaries were sent to do what they could to prepare the warriors for death, and the sentence was carried out. Four hundred women and children were retained as hostages, but regulations were made that none should be mistreated or sold and all were to be sent to the daily instructions of the missionaries.[38]

The Spaniards then took possession of Santa Fé and of the provisions which the Indians had in store. With the immediate needs of the colonists supplied, Governor Vargas was enabled to undertake the conquest of the Teguas and other tribes allied to the Tanos, but they were not entirely subdued until late in 1694.[39]

In the meantime, Father Farfan, the General Custodio and Procurator of the kingdom, was on his way to New Mexico with reinforcements. The new settlers, consisting of some sixty families, had many difficulties in their journey. Delays caused a shortage of provisions, which need Governor Vargas supplied as far as possible, when the petition for aid reached him. The new colonists arrived at Santa Fé in July, 1694, but on account of Indian wars they were obliged to remain there until the following year when Governor Vargas accompanied them to Santa Cruz de la Canada, their destined home. Father Morena, one of the Franciscan band, was assigned as resident priest.[40]

The two years following the conquest of the Tanos at Santa Fé were a period of great activity and anxiety. For a long time

37 BENAVIDES, *Memorial*, notes, p. 236.
38 SHEA, J. G., *op. cit.*, p. 517.
39 READ, B. M., *Illustrated History of New Mexico*, p. 304.
40 READ, B. M., *Illustrated History of New Mexico*, pp. 313-315.

the Spaniards were unable to conquer the defiant northern pueblos, while those of the central district were engaged in internecine warfare among themselves, but eventually Governor Vargas, aided by the Pecos, secured the sworn submission of all. When this was accomplished, the governor and the custodio visited all the pueblos and assigned the Franciscan missionaries to their posts.[41]

Some of the Pueblos had requested resident priests, but others received them with ill disguised reluctance. The governor felt that the presence of the missionaries would ensure the lasting submission of the Indians and the Franciscans cheerfully took up their task, although they realized that in many places they were not welcome. Each priest had two pueblos under his care. In most cases his home was a rudely constructed hut, and no chapel had as yet been erected in the pueblos, since the revolt.[42]

For a time all seemed quiet, and the Spaniards began to rebuild the ranch homes in the outlying districts, and to establish new settlements, but the missionaries living in the midst of the Indians, knew and reported that plans for a new revolt were in progress.[43] In March, 1696, Father Vargas, a distant relative of the governor,[44] and at that time custodio, asked that a small band of soldiers be stationed at each mission as he knew that the priests, alone and unprotected, would be the first victims in case of an uprising. The request was refused, but the governor stated that any missionary who wished to do so might return to Santa Fé. A few availed themselves of this permission, but as they were accused of cowardice in the governor's report to Mexico, they returned to their posts and awaited their fate.[45]

They had but a short time to wait, for in June, 1696, the Picuriés, Taos, Tehuas, Tanos, Queres and Jemez again made an attempt to annihilate the Spaniards.[46] As in 1680, the missionaries were the first martyrs, seven of them meeting death on the same day, but this time they were practically the only victims as the Spaniards were prepared to defend themselves. However, a

41 *Ibid.*, p. 315.
42 SHEA, J. G., *op. cit.*, p. 518.
43 *Ibid.*, p. 519.
44 READ, B. M., *op. cit.*, p. 316.
45 SHEA, J. G., *op. cit.*, pp. 519-520.
46 *Ibid.*, p. 520.

long war was necessary to completely subdue the Indians, and all missionary activities were suspended during that period.[47] When peace was restored, the missions were reestablished and the surviving missionaries and new recruits again took up their work among the Pueblos.

III.

A CENTURY OF VARYING FORTUNES.

The Franciscans nursed no resentment against Governor Vargas, for his refusal to provide adequate protection for the missionaries in 1696, and shortly after this date when the governor was unjustly detained as a prisoner, Father Vargas, the Custodio, journeyed to Mexico in his behalf.[1] At length, De Vargas was exonerated and secured his reappointment as governor of New Mexico.

The official holding this title was not only the head of the civil government and of the army, but he also transacted all official business with the viceroy of Mexico,[2] and as his representative, shared in the Custodio's jurisdiction over the missions and missionaries. In the years preceding 1680, conflicts had occurred between the representatives of the ecclesiastical and secular powers, but after the advent of the eighteenth century these conflicts became more frequent and had more serious results.

Stringent laws protected the rights of the Indians,[3] but sometimes the officials charged with the enforcement of the law were swayed by unworthy motives and oppressed the Pueblos. When such action was reported and confirmed, condemnation and punishment followed immediately. The Religious were often the accusers; if an alcalde were the oppressor, the governor could remedy the abuse; but if the governor were the offending party, the accusation had to be made to the viceroy. Such an occurrence took place in the administration of Governor Chacon (1707-1712). Father Juan de Peña, at that time Custodio, was successful in assembling fugitive Indians and repeopling deserted pueblos, where previous attempts of the military officials had failed.

47 *Ibid.*, p. 521.

1 READ, B. M., *Illustrated History of New Mexico*, p. 316.

2 *Ibid.*, p. 341.

3 BANDELIER, A. F., *Final Report of Investigations in the Southwest*, Part I, p. 196.

His success did not meet with the approval of the governor and difficulties ensued. Father Peña reported the action to the viceroy, accusing the governor of despotism and cruel treatment of the Indians. The charges were confirmed upon investigation, and the governer was censured and fined $2,000.[4]

The solicitude with which the government protected the rights of the Indians is illustrated by another incident which occurred in the same administration. Since the revolt, there had been no parish church at Santa Fé and the governor signified his intention of erecting one at his own expense, but asked that he might employ Indians from the neighboring villages to aid in its construction. The viceroy gave permission for the erection of the building, but stipulated that the workmen must be paid for their labor, and not required to work when their crops needed their attention.[5]

Another conflict between the religious and military authorities occurred in the administration of Governor Mogollon (1712-1715). The opening years of his term of office had been employed in continuous warfare, first with frontier tribes, and then in quelling a Navajo revolt. Thinking to prevent future uprisings, the governor planned to disarm all the Pueblos, and he made this proposal at a conference of colonists and Religious. The Franciscans vigorously protested against such action, contending that the Christian Indians would then be at the mercy of the fierce frontier tribes. When the governor persisted in his plan, the Religious appealed to higher authorities, and won a victory for the Pueblos.[6]

In 1717, the Viceroy forwarded a copy of a royal decree ordering the establishment of schools in all the missions. The Custodio summoned all the Religious to a conference at Santa Fé, in order to decide what could be done. The missionaries were unanimous in sanctioning the establishment of schools for both the Spanish and Indian children.[7] Some, however, wished schools only in mission centers, but the majority thought it better for each pueblo to have its own school. If schools were to

4 READ, B. M., *Illustrated History of New Mexico*, p. 324.
5 SHEA, J. G., *The Catholic Church in Colonial Days*, p. 523.
6 READ, B. M., *op. cit.*, p. 324.
7 SALPOINTE, J. B., *Soldiers of the Cross*, p. 96.

be opened, means of support must be provided. After lengthy discussion, it was decided this could best be secured by requiring contributions of maize. The manner of providing the contribution was left to the decision of the viceroy, but it was suggested that each village be assessed a certain quantity, or that a certain section of land in each settlement be set apart and cultivated in common for the benefit of the teacher.

There are no records showing that schools were established, but interest in the subject did not abate for Fray Muguel Menchero in his *Carta Patente*, 1731, orders schools established in which both the Castilian and Indian languages are to be taught.[8]

The Franciscan Custodio had his headquarters at Santa Fé, but made regular visitations of all the pueblos. He appointed priests to the different missions, and helped them in their difficulties. The annuity, $150 in the early years, $330 after 1665, was sent to the custodio from the royal treasury, and by him forwarded to the individual friars.[9] In his visitations the custodio strove to assist the resident priest in securing the abolishment of the indecent dances and other heathen practices, but it required constant warfare. Energetic governors sometimes took up the work and prohibited estufas or kivas, but as soon as vigilance was relaxed the old heathenism would revive.[10]

This tendency is explained in Mr. A. F. Bandelier's report which he prepared for the Archæological Institute, in which he says:

"The Pueblo Indians accepted the new faith voluntarily, and to a certain extent honestly. They adopted it, however, from their own peculiar viewpoint, that is, they expected material benefits from a creed that pretended to give them spiritual advantages. In their conception, religion is but a rule of conduct controlling man while alive, and on strict compliance with which his success in this world depends. In short, the Pueblos looked upon Christianity as upon another kind of magic, superior to the one they practiced themselves; . . . . To disabuse them was extremely difficult and yet it was done—done through teaching, and also by the force of circumstances."[11]

8 Bandelier, A. F., *op. cit.*, p. 217.
9 Salpointe, J. B., *op. cit.*, pp. 127-128.
10 Shea, J. G., *op. cit.*, p. 523.
11 *Final Report of Investigations in the Southwest*, Part I, pp. 218-219.

The Franciscans were practically the only priests in New Mexico. This necessitated their acting, not only as missionaries to the Indians, but also as parish priests for the Spanish settlers. New Mexico had become a part of the diocese of Durango in 1620, but no bishop visited it during the first century of its existence as such. However, in 1725, Bishop Crespo from Durango undertook to visit the distant parts of his territory and came to El Paso, exercising his episcopal functions there.[12]

Five years later, in a second visitation he reached Santa Fé and administered confirmation. When he attempted to exercise his rights as bishop at the Indian missions, Fray Andres Varo, the custodio, obeying instructions from Mexican Superiors, objected and at the same time refused to acknowledge the authority of the ecclesiastical judge of the bishop's appointment. As a result of this opposition, Bishop Crespo instituted legal proceedings against the Franciscan Superiors, demanding a recognition of his authority; he also made serious charges against the missionaries; alleging that they were negligent in learning the native language; that they did not properly administer the sacraments; that although provisions were made for thirty friars, only twenty-four were serving; that they in other ways neglected their duty and caused scandal.[13]

The first charge, of not learning the Indian language, was supported by the testimony of the governor and other officials, but when the trial came up in Spain in 1736, a counter set of evidence was produced. The Franciscans probably defended their position by the concessions granted by Pope Adrian VI and Pope Paul III, in which the Franciscan Superiors were given episcopal powers, excepting Ordination, over the houses of their Order.[14] But Pope Pius V in 1567, had declared the superiors of the missions to be *parochi*, in the Tridentine sense, both for the Indians and the Spanish who had no other pastor, and as such, the Franciscans would seem to be under the control of the bishop.[15]

12 BANCROFT, H. H., *op. cit.*, Vol. XVII, p. 240.

13 BANCROFT, H. H., *History of Arizona and New Mexico*, Vol. XVII, pp. 240-1.

14 RYAN, EDWIN, "Diocesan Organization in the Spanish Colonies," *Catholic Historical Review*, Vol. IV, pp. 171-172.

15 *Ibid.*, Vol. V, p. 7.

Moreover, Pope Alexander VI and Pope Leo X had declared that the superior of missioners was vicar-general of the bishop, and as such had power to confirm. This fact seems to strengthen the claims of the bishop who would certainly have greater jurisdiction than his vicar-general.[16] Various decisions were rendered regarding this problem. In 1729, a royal order favored the bishop. In 1731, a second order reversed the situation. Two years later the bishop was told to exercise his authority in New Mexico, pending a final decision.[17] No record can be found that this decision was ever given, but succeeding bishops visited New Mexico and were not opposed by the Franciscans.

In 1737, Bishop Elizacochea, the immediate successor of Bishop Crespo came to the Pueblo country, but no records of his visitation remain, other than a memorial carved on "El Moro," the famous inscription rock near the Zuñi pueblo.[18]

The unfortunate disagreement between the Franciscans and the Mexican bishop undoubtedly was productive of evil results, yet missionary activities in New Mexico were not neglected. In 1733, the Franciscans worked for a time among the Jicarilla Apaches near Taos, but the governor interfered, as he claimed that missions in this section diminished the fur trade.[19]

In 1752, Father Juan Menchero secured permission to bring his converts, 350 in number, from Laguna, Zia, and Acoma to repopulate the old pueblo of Sandía, which was placed under the jurisdiction of San Felipe of Alberquerque, in order to afford better protection to the rights of the Indians.[20]

Unforeseen difficulties must have developed, for Sandia was actually reëstablished ten years later, in 1762, when the Lieutenant-General gave possession to Father José Hernandez. It was then only partially habitable, for orders were issued that the Indians should devote two days of the week to manufacturing adobes, and cutting the timber needed to complete the

16 *Ibid.*, Vol. V, p. 7.
17 BANCROFT, H. H., *op. cit.*, Vol. XVII, p. 241.
18 RYAN, EDWIN, *op. cit.*, *Catholic Historical Review*, Vol. V, pp. 7-8.
19 Cited by SHEA in *Catholic Church in Colonial Days*, p. 524.
20 *Spanish Archives of New Mexico*, Vol. II, pp. 221-222.

homes, furthermore, no Indian was allowed to leave the settlement until the pueblo was constructed.[21]

The last bishop to visit New Mexico during the eighteenth century was Bishop Tamaron who in 1760, spent more than two months in this district. During this time he confirmed 11,270 persons, exclusive of the 2,970 whom he had confirmed at or near El Paso. The entire body of Franciscans acknowledged his authority.[22] He, like his predecessors, censured the missionaries for neglecting to learn the Indian languages, and he offered to print prayer books in the native dialects, if the Franciscans would write them.[23]

From the earliest times, Spanish catechisms were distributed in all the missions, but numerous orders had been sent by both civil and religious authorities, that instructions should be given in the Pueblo dialects, also. In Mexico the Indians had readily adopted the Spanish language, but this was not the case with the New Mexican natives. It is possible that the neglect of instruction in their own language may account for the weakness of the Spanish influence among them.[24]

During the administration of Governor Mendinueta, 1762-1778, the most cordial relations existed between the secular and religious authorities, consequently New Mexico enjoyed a period of prosperity and development.[25]

In 1771, the Comanches, who had been the scourge of northern Mexico as well as of the Pueblo district, concluded a treaty with the Spaniards. When it became evident that the effects were to be lasting, the governor ordered a day of thanksgiving to be observed in all the settlements. A few years after the treaty was arranged, two Franciscans, Father Escalante and Father Dominguez, accompanied by an escort of ten soldiers, attempted to find a short route to California. In this, they were unsuccessful, but their explorations in Colorado and Utah, their

21 *Spanish Archives of New Mexico*, Vol. II, pp. 224-225.
22 BANCROFT, H. H., *op. cit.*, Vol. XVII, p. 257.
23 *Ibid.*, p. 257.
24 RYAN, EDWIN, *op. cit.*, *Catholic Historical Review*, Vol. V, p. 8.
25 READ, B. M., *op. cit.*, p. 335.

discovery of Utah and Sevier lakes, give them honored place among the valiant explorers of the great West.[26]

In 1771, New Mexico, Sonora, Durango, and Chihuahua were consolidated into a single province, governed by a Commandante General, who had powers similar to the Mexican viceroy.[27] This arrangement was intended to facilitate governmental activities, the commandante having no fixed residence but traveling over his entire territory.

In 1780, the pueblos were visited by a terrible epidemic of smallpox which caused the death of more than 5,000 Indians. The disease was particularly virulent among the Moqui,[28] who also suffered from famine, drought, and invasion from frontier tribes. Many of these Indians considered these scourges as a punishment from God for having murdered their missionary, Father Garges, a few years before. When the report of their destitute condition reached Santa Fé, the governor and the Franciscans gathered provisions and carried them to the stricken tribe.[29]

The decrease in population, caused by the epidemic, furnished a pretext for Governor Anza to reduce the number of missions.[30] The following year a further reduction was planned, but this measure met with vigorous opposition from the Franciscans.[31] However, from this time the missions steadily declined.

Father Morfi's report of 1792 shows that the Franciscans were aware of the existing evils, and were deeply solicitous for their betterment. He deplores the condition of the Indians, who were oppressed by officials, and cheated by traders, and he begs that artisans, teachers, and machinery be sent to the province.[32] The Spanish settlements were also subjects for his solicitude. The number of settlers had increased greatly, but the settlements were so scattered that the individuals were almost beyond

26 Bolton, H. E. and Marshall, T. M., *The Colonization of N. America*, p. 392.

27 *Spanish Archives of New Mexico*, Vol. II, p. 258.

28 *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 287.

29 Read, B. M., *op. cit.*, p. 344.

30 *Spanish Archives of New Mexico*, Vol. II, p. 287.

31 *Ibid.*, p. 287.

32 Bancroft, H. H., *op. cit.*, Vol. XVII, p. 278.

the reach of law or religion, and exposed to the raids of wandering Indians.[33] Twenty years previous, these same conditions had been reported by Governor Mendinueta, who urged the viceroy to require the settlers to form towns.[34]

In 1760, the Spanish settlers had numbered 7,660, while at the end of the century their population had increased to almost 19,000. In the same period of time, the Indian population showed an increase of less than 600. At the close of the eighteenth century their total number was not 10,000.[35]

Troubles again developed between the missionaries and the secular authorities, and the archives for the closing years of the century are filled with complaints against the missionaries, sent by Governor Chacón to the bishop and commandante. Secular priests were sent from Mexico,[36] but it was not long before they were involved in trouble, and the governor was petitioning for their removal.[37]

As a result of the complaints sent to Mexico, the first Visitador of the Franciscans, Don Juan Maria Vivian de Ortega, came to New Mexico in 1798,[38] and spent some time at all the missions conducted by his Order. The circular sent by the Custodio, announcing his arrival, was passed from mission to mission and then returned to Santa Fé. Its margin is marked by the signatures of sixteen friars, stationed at a like number of pueblos or settlements,[39] from which it is judged that this represents the number of Franciscans engaged in the missionary field of New Mexico at that time.

IV.

A HALF CENTURY OF UNREST. 1800-1850.

In the year which marked the beginning of the nineteenth century, interest was again awakened in the long discussed project of a bishopric for New Mexico, by a notice from Commandante Nava to Governor Chacón calling for a report con-

33 O'GORMAN, THOS., *History of the Roman Catholic Church in U. S.*, p. 72.
34 READ, B. M., *op. cit.*, pp. 337-340.
35 O'GORMAN, THOS., *op. cit.*, p. 73.
36 *Spanish Archives of New Mexico*, Vol. II, p. 388.
37 *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 397-399.
38 READ, B. M., *Illustrated History of New Mexico*, p. 345.
39 *Ibid.*, p. 346.

cerning the missions, territory, etc., in the proposed new diocese[1] of which El Paso was to be a part.

Bishop Olivarez of Durango also testified to his interest in his distant charges by establishing in New Mexico, vicars forain, with powers of ecclesiastical judge, at the same time sending secular priests for the white settlements and giving the parishes canonical form.[2]

According to a decree of the Spanish government issued in February, 1810, New Mexico was entitled to representation in the Spanish Cortés.[3] At a meeting of the leading men of the province held in August of the same year, Don Pedro Bautista Pino was selected as their representative and instructed concerning his duties. He started for Spain in November, 1811, and is believed to have been the first native New Mexican to visit the mother country. In 1812, he submitted to the Cortes a report embodying a description of his country, its condition and its needs.[4]

One chapter of this report was devoted to religious conditions. In it he states that at that time the twenty-six pueblos and one hundred two Spanish settlements were administered by twenty-two Franciscans, while only El Paso and Santa Fé had parish priests.[5] The great distance between the mission centers and the outlying missions prevented many people from hearing Mass on Sunday, as the people could not reach the center nor the priest reach the people.[6] No bishop had visited the province for fifty years. This fact explained the lack of ecclesiastical discipline and the prevalence of many evils. The inhabitants born within the last half century had not been confirmed, and deplorable conditions had arisen from the difficulties entailed in securing marriage dispensations. Nevertheless, during this period the New Mexican Catholics had sent to Durango from nine to ten thousand dollars, as annual tithes.[7]

1 *Spanish Archives of New Mexico*, Vol. II, pp. 408-409.
2 Cited by SHEA in *History of the Catholic Church in the U. S.*, Vol. IV, p. 29.
3 BANCROFT, H. H., *op. cit.*, Vol. XVII, p. 287.
4 *Ibid.*, Vol. XVII, pp. 287-288.
5 PINO, D. PEDRO, *Noticias Historicas . . . del Nuevo Mexico*, p. 31.
6 PINO, D. PEDRO, *Noticias Historicas . . . del Nuevo Mexico*, p. 31.
7 *Ibid.*, p. 31.

In 1777, a royal order had decreed the establishment of a "colegio" as urged by Pope Innocent XI in 1686, but work had progressed only so far as to erect a convent.[8]

As the Franciscans had been the only missionaries in the province, it was urged that they should be given charge of the "colegio," and that one of their Order should be selected as the first bishop.[9] With regard to the maintenance of a bishop, the tithes from New Mexico, being twice the amount which the bishop of Sonora received, would be sufficient for the bishop, would allow him to make some provision for the college, and also for elementary schools.[10]

Besides his official report, Pino was the bearer of a generous contribution to the cause of King Ferdinand, and of many messages from individuals. Father Hocio, a native Spaniard, who had labored for more than a quarter of a century in New Mexico, sent a report written by his own hand.[11] As a result of the pleas of Don Pino, the establishment of a bishopric was ordered for the next year,[12] but as Spain was then engaged in war with France and with her colonies in America, the plan again came to naught.

The Spanish Cortés, in 1812, issued a decree abolishing personal services of the Indians and providing for land and scholarships for them,[13] and the next year the Cortés took up the secularization of the missions,[14] but neither of these acts was published in New Mexico until after 1820.

In 1810, the revolution in Mexico was begun, but on account of the isolated position of New Mexico, very little interest was manifested in the struggle. A pastoral from the Bishop of Sonora, condemning the insurrection of Hidalgo, was received in New Mexico in 1810,[15] and the next year a "bando" issued by the viceroy proscribed Hidalgo's revolutionary writings.[16]

---

8 *Ibid.*, p. 32.
9 *Ibid.*, p. 32.
10 *Ibid.*, p. 33.
11 *Ibid.*, p. 36.
12 PINO, D. PEDRO, *Noticias Historicas . . . del Nuevo Mexico*, p. 92.
13 *Spanish Archives of New Mexico*, Vol. II, p. 572.
14 *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 577.
15 *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 561.
16 *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 563.

In 1813, the Inquisition was abolished by the Spanish Cortés,[17] but this also, had very little bearing on New Mexico, for the Inquisition had no jurisdiction over the American Indians. Claims made that the Indians were persecuted under this system are absolutely untrue.[18]

The constant incursions of the Navajos were a cause of much greater solicitude to the New Mexicans, than the revolution or the Inquisition, and numerous campaigns were conducted against them. Part of the trouble, however, was due to treacherous acts on the part of the white settlers.[19]

The Bishop of Durango sent his Vicar-General, J. B. Ladron del Niño de Guevarra, to New Mexico in 1817. In writing to the bishop, the Visitor asked that at least ten good priests be sent to the province; five to be stationed in the El Paso district, and the others in the more northern section. He also recommended that the limits of the missions should be determined definitely, and that all the churches should be administered by secular priests.[20]

During the Visitor's stay in Santa Fé, a public examination of the schools for both sexes, took place after Mass on Sunday. Governor Allande was invited to attend and the teachers were required to be present, each one at the head of the division intrusted to him or her.[21]

In the second decade of the nineteenth century, Spain could give scant attention to her American colonies, as she was fighting for her very existence as an independent nation.[22] Numerous revolts were inaugurated by Liberal leaders in Spain and fostered in part by Spanish American influence, which desired to prevent the sending of troops to America. This seems to have been largely the work of societies of Freemasons, to which most of the military authorities belonged.[23]

When Mexico finally secured separation from Spain, and Iturbide was recognized as emperor, the event was celebrated

17 *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 573.
18 BANDELIER, A. F., *Final Report of Investigations in Southwest*, Part I, p. 215.
19 PRINCE, L. B., *Historical Sketches of New Mexico*, p. 232.
20 SALPOINTE, J. B., *Soldiers of the Cross*, p. 128.
21 *Ibid.*, p. 106.
22 CHAPMAN, C. E., *History of Spain*, p. 492.
23 *Ibid.*, p. 495.

with great enthusiasm at Santa Fé.[24] An edict was sent to New Mexico by Archbishop Pedro José de Fonte, respecting obedience to the government in power. A supplement to the document was addressed to the regular and secular clergy of the diocese.[25]

During the short period of the Mexican empire, the government was not hostile to the Church, and no external hostility was manifested during the first years of the Mexican republic, but the influence of the Masonic lodges caused a division into two political parties, whose divergent views led to numerous revolutions and the desolation of their country.[26]

In order to counteract the influence of Freemasonry, the ecclesiastical authorities endeavored to spread religious instruction among the clergy and people. The opening of a college for young men at Santa Fé, in May, 1826, was an outgrowth of these efforts.[27] Renewed interest in primary schools was also in evidence in the principal towns of the province between 1827 and 1832.[28]

In 1827, the Mexican Congress passed a law expelling all native born Spaniards from the republic.[29] Since no exception was made for Religious, the Spanish missionaries were driven out. A concession was made in behalf of two aged priests of New Mexico, but on condition that each should pay $500.[30]

The See of Durango was without a bishop at this time, and as a means of remedying the situation caused by the expulsion of the Spanish priests the Vicar Capitular, José Iturribarra, convoked the priests of the Durango diocese to a concursus, in an effort to supply the vacancies.[31]

In D. Antonio Barreiro's report of New Mexico in 1831, which is included in the 1849 edition of Pino's *Noticias Historicas*,[32] there is the oft repeated recital of the miseries of the re-

24 BANCROFT, H. H., *op. cit.*, Vol. XVII, pp. 308-309.
25 *Spanish Archives of New Mexico*, Vol. II, p. 648.
26 SALPOINTE, J. B., *op. cit.*, p. 159.
27 *Ibid.*, p. 160.
28 BANCROFT, H. H., *op. cit.*, Vol. XVII, p. 341.
29 SALPOINTE, J. B., *op. cit.*, p. 143.
30 PRINCE, L. B., *Historical Sketches of New Mexico*, p. 233.
31 SALPOINTE, J. B., *op. cit.*, p. 164.
32 PINO, D. PEDRO, *Noticias Historicas . . . del Nuevo Mexico*, pp, II-III.

ligious situation, but D. Barreiro makes a suggestion which might better conditions:—

> "Para remediar en parte este mal, seria muy oportuno que los eclesiásticos, si servian diez años en la cura de almas de estos pueblos, con aprobacion del supremo gobierno, se les atendiese con preferencia, para obtener prebendas en las catedrales de la república; pues solo de esta manera se podria estimular a eclesiásticos de virtud y recomendacion para que viniesen á prestar sus fatigas en beneficio de estos infelices habitantes."[33]

His report ends with the usual plea for the establishment of a bishopric and a seminary.

In 1832, Reverend Juan Felipe Ortiz, a native New Mexican, was appointed Vicar-General Forane of the territory,[34] a position which he retained until a bishop was appointed for Santa Fé. In the following year Bishop Zubiria visited New Mexico and although he was welcomed by the people, he was not able to arouse much enthusiasm for the restoration of the churches which he found in a ruinous condition.[35]

In the general disorder, which was the result of the revolution which disturbed New Mexico in 1837-38, and of the fears of invasions from Texas, and of distrust of the United States:— all activities, religious and otherwise, were almost paralyzed. When the United States actually invaded the country and took possession of Santa Fé, August, 1846, General Kearney in his first statement promised to protect the lives and religion of the inhabitants,[36] and in the formal declaration of rights, proclaimed September 22, 1846, freedom of worship and protection of all Christian religions were provided for in section third.[37] This religious freedom was maintained from that time forward.

New Mexico became a part of the United States by the exchange of ratifications of the treaty of Hidalgo, by the two nations concerned, May 30, 1848.[38]

This newly acquired territory was of great interest to all citizens of the United States, and especially to the hierarchy of

---

33 Pino, D. Pedro, *Noticias Historicas . . . del Nuevo Mexico*, p. 34.
34 Shea, J. G., *Catholic Church in the U. S.*, Vol. IV, p. 304.
35 *Ibid.*, Vol. IV, pp. 304-305.
36 Bancroft, H. H., *op. cit.*, Vol. XVII, p. 417.
37 Read, B. M., *Illustrated History of New Mexico*, pp. 439-440.
38 Ladd, H. O., *The War with Mexico*, p. 311.

the Catholic Church who were now responsible for the religious life in this section. The consciousness of this obligation led the Fathers of the VII Council of Baltimore to petition the Holy Father Pope Pius IX for the erection of a Vicariate Apostolic in New Mexico.[39]

V.

REORGANIZATION AND DEVELOPMENT. 1850-1875.

In response to the petition of the VII Baltimore Council, Pope Pius IX on July 19, 1850, erected the Vicariate of New Mexico and on July 23 of the same year appointed Rev. J. B. Lamy Vicar Apostolic,[1] with the title of Bishop of Agathonica. The Vicariate included all the territory which the United States acquired by the treaty of Hidalgo, with the exception of the towns of Doña Anna and Las Cruces.[2] These remained subject to the jurisdiction of Durango until 1858, when they were annexed to the Vicariate.[3]

Although New Mexico had become a part of the United States, Bishop Zubiria paid a last visit to this section in October, 1850. He traveled from settlement to settlement endeavoring to arouse the Catholics to a sense of their responsibility, urging them to rebuild their churches, and to rekindle their faith in the face of the dangers to which it would be exposed.[4]

In the selection of Father John B. Lamy as head of the new Vicariate the Holy See had chosen a priest singularly fitted for the arduous task. John Baptist Lamy was born in Lempdes, France, October 11, 1814. In his early youth he decided to become a priest and his parents anxious to further his desires, sent him to Clermont for his classical education, and later he attended the Seminary at Montferrand. He was ordained by Mgr. Ferron, Bishop of Clermont, in December, 1838,[5] and after his ordination spent some months as assistant priest at Chapre. When in 1839, Bishop Purcell of Cincinnati visited France in

39 SALPOINTE, J. B., *op. cit.*, p. 193.
1 SALPOINTE, J. B., *Soldiers of the Cross*, p. 194.
2 *Ibid.*, p. 195.
3 *Ibid.*, p. 195.
4 SHEA, J. G., *The Catholic Church in the U. S.*, Vol. IV, p. 306.
5 DEFOURI, J. H., *Historical Sketch of the Catholic Church in N. M.*, p. 31.

an effort to secure priests for his diocese,[6] Father Lamy enlisted as one of the missionary band. At the time of his appointment as Bishop of Agathonica, he had spent eleven years of fruitful labor in the missions of Ohio and Kentucky.[7]

Conscious that many duties awaited him in his new field of labor, Father Lamy was anxious to begin his work. His consecration took place at St. Peter's Cathedral, Cincinnati, Ohio, November 24, 1850. The Bishops of Louisville, Cleveland, and Vincennes, were the consecrators and Bishop Purcell delivered the sermon, preaching on the Apostolic Succession.[8]

The journey to New Mexico was long and beset with many difficulties hence Bishop Lamy did not reach Santa Fé until the summer of 1851. On his arrival he found that neither clergy nor people were willing to recognize his authority.[9] The diocese of Durango had not been canonically divided, nor had New Mexico been formally detached from it, so the New Mexicans still claimed that Bishop Zubiria was their superior.[10]

Realizing that it would be necessary to consult the Bishop of Durango, Bishop Lamy set out at once for Mexico. In Durango, Bishop Zubiria received him kindly, and resigned all jurisdiction over the territory assigned to the new Vicariate.[11] The difficulty being thus settled, Bishop Lamy returned to Santa Fé and published the documents which established his authority.[12]

In order to secure accurate knowledge of the territory assigned to his care, the bishop visited the various missions. In his report to Propaganda in 1865, he states that in 1850, he found "in the vast vicariate, twenty priests, neglectful and extortionate, churches in ruins, and no schools."[13]

After a few months, during which the bishop had become acquainted with the needs of his people, and provided for their wants as far as his limited powers permitted, he was summoned to Baltimore to take part in the First Plenary Council, convoked

6 DEFOURI, J. H., *op. cit.*, p. 31.
7 SALPOINTE, J. H., *Soldiers of the Cross*, p. 195.
8 MCCANN, S. M. A., *Archbishop Purcell*, p. 86.
9 DEFOURI, J. H., *op. cit.*, p. 34.
10 SHEA, J. G., *Catholic Church in the United States*, Vol. IV, p. 307.
11 *Ibid.*, p. 307.
12 SALPOINTE, J. B., *op. cit.*, p. 199.
13 *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. 1, p. 720.

in May, 1852.[14] One of the requests made by this body to the Holy Father, was for the erection of an episcopal see at Santa Fé.[15] This was effected by a decree of Pope Pius IX, dated July 29, 1853, and Bishop Lamy became first Bishop of Santa Fé.[16]

Feeling that schools were a necessity in the upbuilding of New Mexico, Bishop Lamy applied for the assistance of the Sisters of Loretto, of Loretto, Kentucky. On his homeward journey from Baltimore, the bishop visited the Loretto Motherhouse, and personally explained conditions in the Southwest. The Sisters were much interested, not appalled by the arduous work involved, and the Community accepted the offer. Out of the volunteers, six Sisters were selected for the new foundation, and Sister Matilda was appointed Superior.[17]

As it was necessary for Bishop Lamy to visit New Orleans, it was arranged that the Sisters would meet him at St. Louis, and the party then proceed to Santa Fé. After leaving St. Louis, on the steamer, *Kansas*, the Superior died of cholera and two other Sisters became seriously ill. Both recovered, although one was not able to continue the journey at that time.[18]

Untold hardships were endured in the two month's journey required in crossing the plains to New Mexico, but untold blessings resulted from the coming of these courageous Sisters. A school under the patronage of Our Lady of Light, was opened January, 1853, and with this, the work of the Loretto Sisters in the Southwest was inaugurated. Other Sisters from the motherhouse in Kentucky, from time to time, joined the original colony, and a novitiate was established at Santa Fé in 1855.[19]

With these accessions, it was possible for the Sisters to extend their work to new fields. The first branch house was opened at Taos, in 1863, and the following year a second establishment was made at Mora.[20] In the same year the Loretto Sisters began work in Colorado, when they answered Father Machebeuf's appeal for assistance in the educational field, by

14 DEFOURI, J. H., *op. cit.*, p. 36.
15 SHEA, J. G., *Catholic Church in the United States*, Vol. IV, p. 369.
16 O'DONNELL, J. H., *Catholic Hierarchy of the United States*, p. 177.
17 MINOGUE, A. C., *Loretto Annals of the Century*, p. 137.
18 MINOGUE, A. C., *Loretto Annals of the Century*, pp. 139-140.
19 *Ibid.*, p. 148.
20 *Ibid.*, p. 148.

establishing St. Mary's Academy, Denver. Schools were also established at Albuquerque, Las Vegas, and Las Cruces, before 1871.[21] Practically all of these schools in a short time became very flourishing, but in the beginning many privations were suffered. Fires destroyed the schools at Mora, Denver, and Las Vegas, but larger and more substantial buildings rose on the old foundations.

When Bishop Lamy returned to New Mexico, many things seemed to demand immediate attention. In company with Father Machebeuf, his Vicar General, he again in 1853, traveled over most of his immense territory,[22] correcting abuses, and encouraging every worthy attempt for the amelioration of his people. In 1854, Bishop Lamy visited Rome, and while in Europe, endeavored to secure priests and ecclesiastical students for his diocese. He succeeded in finding a number of apostolic men, willing to devote their lives to the American missions. These, accordingly, joined his party which proceeded to New Mexico.[23]

With these additions to his clergy, the bishop was able to reopen some of the missions, which at one time were flourishing, but in later years had been closed. The Pueblo Indians were not neglected. The bishop personally visited the various pueblos,[24] and sent priests to minister to them, but the Indian policy adopted by the United States government made it impossible for him to do all that he desired.[25]

Well pleased with the results of his first entreaty for missionaries, the bishop decided to make a second appeal to Europe, in 1856. Father Machebeuf was delegated to make the journey, and he succeeded in securing six laborers for the diocese. The seminarians who had been members of the first group of missionaries, had continued their studies, and in due time were ordained, as were several native sons of the diocese. Some of the priests from Europe were not able to endure the climate of New Mexico, but the majority of the volunteers remained at their posts until death.[26]

21 *Ibid.*, p. 155.
22 DEFOURI, J. H., *op. cit.*, p. 44.
23 DEFOURI, J. H., *op. cit.*, pp. 45-46.
24 SHEA, J. G., *The Catholic Church in the U. S.*, Vol. IV, p. 665.
25 *Ibid.*, Vol. IV, p. 665.
26 SALPOINTE, J. B., *Soldiers of the Cross*, pp. 206-209.

In 1859, the section of southern Arizona and New Mexico known as the "Gadsen Purchase" was added to the diocese of Santa Fé.[27] At this time the only white settlers in the whole of Arizona were located in this section.[28] In order to ascertain if it were possible to establish missions there, Bishop Lamy sent Father Machebeuf to this territory. He established his headquarters at Tucson, a village of about four hundred inhabitants, and extended his labors among the Indians and white settlers at San Xaxier and Tubac. The inhabitants were almost all Catholics, and welcomed the opportunity of receiving the Sacraments, which they had been deprived of for many years.[29]

Early missions had been established in Arizona by the Jesuits, and when they were expelled in 1767, the Franciscans were sent to replace them, only in their turn to be driven out in 1827, by the decree of the Mexican government. After this the faith was kept alive by the infrequent visits of Mexican priests.[30]

Father Machebeuf found it necessary to settle the question of jurisdiction with the bishop of Sonora, who had not been notified of the decree of Propaganda. In Mexico, Bishop Losa accorded him every honor, and gave him all the documents necessary for the cession of Arizona to Santa Fé.[31]

Father Machebeuf returned to New Mexico only to find that the bishop found it necessary to send him on a similar journey to Colorado, which by the request of Bishop Miége had been transferred from the Vicariate East of the Rocky Mountains to the diocese of Santa Fé in 1860.[32]

At once, Father Machebeuf set out for Denver. After a careful investigation of the situation he returned to Santa Fé in order to make preparations for future permanent missions. In the following year he returned to Colorado, accompanied by Father J. B. Raverdy, and these two missionaries by their zealous labors, laid the foundation for the diocese of Denver. The country developed rapidly, and in 1868, Colorado and Utah were

27 DEFOURI, J. H., *op. cit.*, p. 56.
28 BANCROFT, H. H., *History of Arizona and New Mexico*, Vol. XVII, p. 474.
29 SALPOINTE, J. B., *Soldiers of the Cross*, pp. 224-226.
30 *Ibid.*, p. 226.
31 DEFOURI, J. H., *op. cit.*, p. 70.
32 SHEA, J. G., *The Catholic Church in the U. S.*, Vol. IV, p. 665.

erected into a Vicariate Apostolic, with Father Machebeuf as Vicar Apostolic.[33]

In the meantime, Bishop Lamy was steadily building up the diocese of Santa Fé. In order to secure additional priests and to provide for the education of the young men of New Mexico, he sent his second Vicar General, Father Eguillon, to Europe in 1858. This third appeal was also answered: two priests, four seminarians, and four students, as well as, five Christian Brothers responded, and the party reached Santa Fé in 1859. In December of the same year, the Christian Brothers opened a school which in a few years became San Miguel College. Four additional Brothers came in 1865, and schools were opened at both Taos and Mora, the former was discontinued after two years, but in 1872, a school was opened at Bernalillo. These schools, furnishing means for the Christian education of the youth of New Mexico have contributed greatly to the development of the state and diocese.[34]

When Bishop Lamy recalled Father Machebeuf from Arizona, he promised to send priests to minister to the Catholics there. He asked the Jesuits to take charge of the missions, and in 1863, he undertook a long journey to California in order to complete arrangements. When he arrived at Los Angeles, he found that two Jesuits had already reached Tucson. In returning to Santa Fé, the bishop spent three weeks at the Arizona missions, administering confirmation, and encouraging the missionaries and their flock. The following year the Jesuits were obliged to relinquish the missions. The route from Santa Fé to Arizona, was at this time, extremely dangerous on account of the Apache raids, and the bishop hesitated to send priests into such danger. However, his wishes were known, and three priests volunteered but were unable to reach Arizona. The following year (1866) other volunteers presented themselves, and by securing a military escort were able to reach Tucson. Father Salpointe, the future bishop, was appointed Vicar. He found the walls of a church but the timber necessary to cover them with a roof had to be hauled 46 miles. Schools were opened, but forced to close in a short time for lack of funds. In spite of all

33 Howlett, W. J., *Life of Bishop Machebeuf*, p. 337.

34 Defouri, J. H., *op. cit.*, pp. 50-55.

these discouraging features, in a short time this section became a prosperous territory, Arizona became a Vicariate Apostolic in 1868, but official notice of his appointment as Vicar Apostolic did not reach Father Salpointe until February, 1869.[35]

Evidence of the improved conditions in the Santa Fé diocese, is presented in Bishop Lamy's report to Propaganda in 1865. At that time, he stated that there were under his jurisdiction thirty-seven priests and six ecclesiastical students in Minor Orders. In the past fifteen years, 45 churches and chapels had been erected, besides the 18 or 20 which had been repaired. In the educational field, there were seven schools: four conducted by the Sisters of Loretto, three, by the Brothers of the Christian Schools. The Catholic population, he estimated at 100,000, including 9,000 Pueblo Indians.[36]

Bishop Lamy had reasons for rejoicing in the progress noted in his report, yet he felt the need of a Catholic hospital and orphanage. In order to provide these, he secured the services of the Sisters of Charity. Four Sisters from the Motherhouse of Cedar Grove, near Cincinnati, Ohio, reached Santa Fé in September, 1865, and at once opened St. Vincent's Hospital and Orphanage.[37] In 1866, Bishop Lamy, accompanied by his secretary, Rev. J. M. Coudert, attended the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore, and took an important part in the deliberations of that body. At the conclusion of the sessions he was honored in being selected to carry the Acts of the Council to the Holy See for approbation.[38]

While in Rome, Bishop Lamy visited the Superior General of the Jesuits and petitioned for a foundation of that Order in his diocese. All arrangements were completed and three Fathers and two Brothers of the Province of Naples were selected for the mission. Bishop Lamy also enlisted the services of other ecclesiastics from Italy and France. On reaching America, the party proceeded to Baltimore, where the bishop left seven students to complete their theological studies at St. Mary's Seminary.[39]

---

35 DEFOURI, J. H., *op. cit.*, pp. 50-55.
36 SHEA, J. G., *The Catholic Church in the U. S.*, Vol. IV, p. 666.
37 DEFOURI, J. H., *op. cit.*, pp. 102-103.
38 DEFOURI, J. H., *op. cit.*, p. 106.
39 *Ibid.*, p. 108.

Sisters of Loretto and Christian Brothers joined the group at St. Louis. In following the famous Santa Fé trail, they joined a strong Mexican caravan, and this probably saved the lives of all the travelers, for Comanche Indians attacked the party and besieged them for three hours. No fatalities resulted during the attack, but one of the Sisters died the following day. The survivors reached Santa Fé August 15, escorted by two hundred horsemen who had journeyed many miles to meet and welcome their bishop.[40]

On their arrival in New Mexico, the Jesuits were given Bernalillo as their residence,[41] but they were also to attend Peña Blanca and Jemez, as well as the missions attached to each. Besides, they taught the seminarians, gave retreats to the clergy, Sisters, and Brothers, and preached many missions in the different parishes. In 1868, with the bishop's consent the Jesuits left Bernalillo and established themselves at Albuquerque. Schools were opened and one of the Jesuits, Father Gasparri, attempted to establish a mission among the Navajos, but the project was abandoned, and the government put the work in the hands of the Methodists.[42]

In 1874, at the close of a mission at Las Vegas, a committee requested the Jesuits to open a college in their vicinity. The offer was accepted, and from this humble beginning came the Las Vegas College. In 1875, the Jesuits undertook the publication of *Revista Católica*, which survived many attacks and rendered great service to the Catholic cause in New Mexico.[43]

One of the greatest monuments to the zeal of Bishop Lamy is the Cathedral of San Francisco, which he planned but did not see completed. The cornerstone was laid July 14, 1869, and the foundation was begun by an American architect, but his work proved unsatisfactory. Under the direction of the French architects, Antoine Mouly and son, the work was recommenced. The walls are of native rock quarried in the vicinity of Santa Fé.[44]

40 *Ibid.*, pp. 113-117.
41 SALPOINTE, J. B., *Soldiers of the Cross*, p. 258.
42 DEFOURI, J. H., *op. cit.*, pp. 120-126.
43 *Ibid.*, p. 127.
44 *Ibid.*, pp. 143-145.

Bishop Lamy was untiring in his efforts to provide for and to protect the faith of the Pueblo Indians. Under the so-called "Peace Policy" inaugurated by President Grant in 1870, the government claimed to give the Indian agencies to such religious denominations as had hitherto established missions and sent missionaries among the Indians. In reality the results were that many Protestant teachers were sent among Catholic Indians.[45] In New Mexico, a Protestant missionary, supported in part by a Presbyterian Missionary Society, and partly by the government, was sent to one of the pueblos, and although Catholics were twice as numerous as Protestants, the agent refused to support a Catholic teacher.[46] This injustice led Bishop Lamy to write to General Ewing, in 1874, giving a history of the Pueblo Indians in proof that they were converted by Catholic missionaries, and citing their request of a previous year for Catholic teachers, as an evidence of their attachment to their faith. On these grounds, the bishop asked for an appropriation of $500 for the maintenance of a school under Catholic auspices, in each of the twelve pueblos in which religious services were held regularly, and in addition he requested an appropriation that would enable him to have some of the boys and girls from each pueblo educated at Santa Fé.[47]

In February, 1875, Pope Pius IX erected the Province of Santa Fé, and raised Bishop Lamy to the dignity of Archbishop,[48] with the Vicars Apostolic of Colorado and of Arizona as suffragans. The Pallium was brought to New York by Monsignor Roncetti, who had been delegated by the Holy Father to carry the insignia of a Cardinal to Archbishop McCloskey of New York.[49] It was then entrusted to Monsignor Salpointe, Vicar Apostolic of Arizona, who was thus privileged to deliver the Pallium to his beloved Superior. The ceremony in which the Pallium was bestowed took place June 16 at St. Michael's College,[50] and the entire Catholic population strove in every way to do

45 *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. XII, p. 584.

46 "Bishop Lamy's Letter," *Record of American Catholic Historical Society*, Vol. XII, pp. 185-187.

47 *Ibid.*, Vol. XII, pp. 191-192.

48 O'DONNELL, J. H., *Catholic Hierarchy of the United States*, p. 177.

49 SALPOINTE, J. B., *op. cit.*, p. 264.

50 *Ibid.*, p. 264.

honor to the bishop who had labored in their midst for twenty-five years, and who so truly exemplified in his life the virtues typical of the Shepherd of the flock.

SR. M. RAMONA, S. C. N., M.A.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BANDELIER, A. F., *Final Report of Investigations in the Southwest.* Cambridge, 1890.

BANCROFT, H. H., *History of Arizona and New Mexico.* San Francisco, 1889.

BENAVIDES, FRAY ALONSO, *The Memorial of Fray Alonso de Benavides.* Translated by Mrs. Edward E. Ayer, annotated by Frederick Webb. Chicago, 1916.

BOLTON, H. E., and MARSHALL, T. M., *The Colonization of North America.* New York, 1920.

BOLTON, H. E., *The Spanish Borderlands.* Volume XXIII, The Chronicle of America Series. New Haven, 1921.

CHAPMAN, C. E., *A History of Spain.* New York, 1918.

Catholic Encyclopedia.

Catholic Historical Review.

Catholic University Bulletin.

Catholic World.

DEFOURI, Rev. J. H., *The Martyrs of New Mexico.* New Mexico, 1893.

DEFOURI, Rev. J. H., *Historical Sketch of the Church in New Mexico.* San Francisco, 1887.

FOREMAN, Grant, *Pioneer Days in the Early Southwest.* Cleveland, 1926.

Handbook of American Indians North of Mexico. Bulletin 30. Bureau of American Ethnology. Edited by F. W. Hodge. Washington, 1912.

HELPS, Arthur, *The Spanish Conquest in America.* London. 1855-1861.

Hispanic American Historical Review.

HOWLETT, Rev. W. J., *Life of Bishop Machebeuf.* Colorado, 1908.

HUGHES, John T., *Doniphan's Expedition.* Cincinnati, 1848.

Illinois Catholic Historical Review.

Indian Sentinel. Pueblo Number, October, 1918.

LADD, Horatio O., *History of the War With Mexico.* New York, 1883.

LAMOTT, Rev. John H., *History of the Archdiocese of Cincinnati.* Cincinnati, 1921.

LUMMIS, Charles F., *The Land of Poco Tiempo.* New York, 1893.

MCCANN, Sister Mary Agnes, *Archbishop Purcell.* Washington, 1918.

MINOGUE, Anna C., *Loretto Annals of the Century.* New York, 1912.

O'DONNELL, Rev. J. H., *Catholic Hierarchy of the United States.* Catholic University of America Studies in American Church History. Washington, 1922.

O'GORMAN, Rev. Thomas, *History of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States.* American Church History Series, Vol. IX. New York, 1907.

Noticias Historicas y Estadisticas de la Antigua Provincia Del Nuevo Mexico . . presentados por so disputado en cortes D. Pedro Bautista Pino En Cadiz el Ano de, 1812.
Adicionadas por el Lic. D. Antonio Barreiro en 1839 y ultimamente anotadas por el Lic. Don Jose Augustin de Escudero para la comision de estadistica militar de la Republica Mexicana. Mexico. Imprenta De Lara, Calle de la Palma, 1849.

PRINCE, Bradford L., *Historical Sketches of New Mexico.* New York, 1883.

READ, Benjamin M., *Ilustrated History of New Mexico.* New Mexico, 1912.

Records of American Catholic Historical Society. Philadelphia—begun 1884.
Vol. XII—*Bishop Lamy's History of the Pueblo Indians.*

SALPOINTE, Rev. J. B., *Soldiers of the Cross.* California, 1898.

SHEA, J. G., *The Catholic Church in the United States.* (4 volumes). Rahway, N. J., 1892.

SHEA, J. G., *Catholic Missions Among the Indian Tribes of the U. S.* New York, 1857.

TWITCHELL, Ralph E., *The Spanish Archives of New Mexico.* (2 volumes). Cedar Rapids, 1914.

WINSOR, Justin, *Narrative and Critical History of America.* Cambridge, 1884-1889.

MISCELLANY

LOUIS PHILIPPE'S DONATIONS TO THE OLD CATHEDRAL OF BARDSTOWN

The present writer contributed an article to the CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW, (Jan. 1928, pp. 657-662) the object of which was to go over the disputed question, whether Louis Philippe, king of France, had made donations to the old Cathedral of Bardstown, Kentucky. In the July number of the same review (pp. 250-254) Mr. Young E. Allison disagreed with my conclusions.

The whole discussion grew out of a talk which Mr. Allison had made before the Filson Club of Louisville, Ky., in which he claimed that there was no evidence of any such donation. His talk was scarcely printed when his attention was called to two extracts from the writings of Archbishop Martin John Spalding. In his *Sketches* of the missionary priests of Kentucky, Archbishop Spalding wrote: "The cathedral was also provided with rich suits of vestments, golden candlesticks, a golden tabernacle and other splendid ornaments presented to the Bishop by the king and queen of France." (See p. 247)

In his Life of Flaget Spalding, after referring to an act of kindness on the part of Flaget to Louis Philippe when the latter was an exiled prince, wrote: "This act was remembered long afterwards, when Louis Philippe was King of France and he, the Bishop of Bardstown." (p. 52)

In two different books, therefore, Spalding asserts that Louis Philippe gave presents to Bishop Flaget, and in one of them that these presents were for the cathedral. I do not see how any historian can discard this evidence. The historical writings of Spalding were known, and are still known, for their exact scholarship. He was a co-laborer with Flaget in Louisville, his intimate friend, and his biographer. These documents from the pen of Spalding should have ended the controversy.

Mr. Allison was shown a second document, a speech given in the House of Representatives in 1832 by Mr. Wickliffe of Kentucky. This Representative had introduced a bill to have the duties set aside on certain goods shipped from Lyons, France, to New Orleans. Mr. Wickliffe declared before his fellow representatives that the goods in question were given by Louis Philippe to Bishop Flaget. Mr. Allison shrugs his shoulders and cries out that the legend of the gift of Louis Philippe went back to that date.

A third document bearing the date of 1828 was put before Mr. Allison. "A trick of politicians," he replies, "these politicians will say anything to gain a point."

A fourth document was produced. Representative Moore of Kentucky maintained that the shipment was a gift of Louis Philippe to Bishop Flaget. But where did this official get his information? To claim that it was the trick of a politician to insert a legend on official documents to carry his point, and this with the connivance of the saintly Bishop Flaget, is to besmirch the name of both, and that with no evidence whatever. All of the encomiums of Young E. Allison about the early missionaries of Kentucky are more than offset by this calumny against Bishop Flaget.

With all this historical evidence before him I do not see how Mr. Allison could write in a communication to the Commonweal (Nov. 16, 1927), that: "His paper aroused much new controversy, but no *new facts* have emerged".

In his reply Mr. Allison said that I allowed myself to be swayed by sentiment. Now let me put sentiment aside and follow logical conclusions. Mr. Allison has a most unscientific way of reasoning. In his first article he exaggerated the legend of Louis Philippe, then answered his own exaggerations. There were legends about Louis Philippe—legends that he had lived for a considerable time in Kentucky, taught French, etc. These legends were easily disproved, therefore he concluded that Louis Philippe did not give donations to the old cathedral of Bardstown. I can argue that there are many legends about Washington and Lincoln; these have been proved false, therefore neither Washington nor Lincoln was president of the United States. My arguments are just a logical as are those of Mr. Allison.

Here is another specimen of Mr. Allison's methods. In his reply to me he writes: "Father Spalding sets out to prove that Louis Philippe, King of France, while Duke of Orleans, in 1824 presented to Bishop Flaget, the pioneer of Bardstown, fine vestments, several valuable *Old Masters* in painting, and other articles for Flaget's first cathedral at Bardstown." (THE CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW, July, 1928, p. 250). Now I said nothing of the kind; and the difference between what I said and what Mr. Allison makes me say changes the entire nature of the controversy. I maintained in my article that the gift "consisted of pictures and other church furniture." I used the words of the "bill of lading." I called it a "bill of lading," and Mr. Allison calls it "a formal entry of merchandise in customs." I am willing to accept his wording. I said nothing of *Old Masters*. He has no right to quote me for such a statement. But permit me to follow his argument. In the very beginning of the paper I am quoted for the *Old Masters*. At the end of his paper he shows that it would be impossible to secure copies of the *Old Masters*. In other words he sets up a puppet—he makes a false statement and then refutes himself.

I did claim and still claim that the large pictures in the old cathedral are beautiful, artistic and worthy to be the gifts of the kings, and worthy of the House of God. That is all I have ever claimed for them. Reviewing the controversy I wish to repeat that the clear statements of Archbishop Martin John Spalding are sufficient for me. He lived at the time of Flaget; he was the companion of Flaget. He wrote that Louis Philippe had given valuable donations to the old Cathedral of Bardstown. I prefer to accept his written statements rather than Allison's denials, interpretations, or affirmations.

At the end of his paper Mr. Allison writes: "There are a number of careless readings in Father Spalding's article. He says, for instance that Franciscus 1, Utruisque Cicilae Rex, to whom three pictures are accredited, was a brother-in-law to Louis Philippe. But Louis Philippe married the sister of Ferdinand V of Naples and II of Sicilies—the Notorious Bomba of Italian history, and if Francis I of Naples and Sicily gave any pictures he rose from a long occupied grave to do so."

Possibly I made mistakes, but Mr. Allison's selection of the above as an example of my mistakes is singularly unfortunate for himself. I did maintain,

and still maintain, that Louis Philippe was the brother-in-law of Francis I of the Two Sicilies; and if Mr. Allison had been the careful historian he claims to be, he would have said the same. If he had only consulted an ordinary encyclopedia or any standard history of the times he would have said the same. Here are two short extracts from the New International Enclycopedia:

"In 1809 Louis Philippe married Marie Amelie, the daughter of Ferdinand I of the Two Sicilies." (See vol. 14, page 410)

"Francis I, King of the Two Sicilies was the son of Ferdinand I." (See vol. 14, page 164) Ferdinand I was also known as Ferdinand IV (of Naples).

Now I wonder who is the careless writer, myself or Young E. Allison? And Francis I rose from a long occupied grave, according to Mr. Allison. Did he? He was born in 1777 and died in 1830. His donations to the old cathedral were about the year 1825. Wrong again Mr. Allison. And mind you this is the very passage which you have selected to prove that I was a careless historian. Shame on the historian who confounds this Francis with some of the bygone rulers of other centuries!

This proof for the relationship of Louis Philippe to Francis I of the Two Sicilies is essential to the understanding of the question before us, for some of the old pictures in the cathedral of Bardstown bear the Latin inscriptions given above. If Louis Philippe was brother-in-law to Francis I, (and he was) then we have an explanation of the gifts of Francis I to the western cathedral. His brother-in-law or his sister influenced him to make the donation. Hence "The Gifts of Kings", the title of my first article.

It has often been a pleasure for the writer to study some historical question in the Newberry Library, Chicago. I have met students there, who came from long distances to enjoy the privileges of research in this richly endowed institution. The wonderful historical collection and the assistance of the highly trained specialists combine to make hours of study at the Newberry Library a real joy. On several occasions, too, I have written to the librarian of the Newberry Library for some difficult problem of historical research. In order, therefore, to get the statement of specialists, (although no such statement was needed) I wrote a letter and asked whether Louis Philippe was brother-in-law to Francis I. The prompt reply came back from Mr. William Stetson Merrill:

"Louis Philippe, king of France, married on Nov. 25, 1809, the princess Amelie, daughter of Ferdinand IV, King of the Two Sicilies. Francis I (1777-1830) was son of Ferdinand IV. Louis Philippe thus became brother-in-law to Ferdinand." Several references are given.

During the last two days I have carefully gone over the original paper of Mr. Young E. Allison written five years ago. It is not history; it is unworthy to be called historical writing. It is a pleasant, witty paper, intended to amuse the members of the Filson Club.[1]

The whole paper of Mr. Allison is shallow and misleading. He exaggerates the legend of Louis Philippe in and near Bardstown, Kentucky, easily answers his own exaggerations, falsely connects the gifts of Louis Philippe with the

1 I made the mistake of calling it the Pilton Club, and really the name is quite appropriate, for its members swallowed the pleasant, coated pill, which the speaker gave them, and thought that it was historical candy.

legend, and ends in denying any such gifts. I am not attacking his honesty of purpose, but I candidly fail to see how he can cling to his first statements in view of the fact of the unanswerable historical proofs which have come to light since he first read his paper before the Filson Club.

Years ago the novelist, James Lane Allen, enjoyed the hospitality of the Trappist Monks in Kentucky, and in return wrote the vile story of the *White Cowl*. He visited the Sisters of Loretto, and after departing wrote the mean story of *Sister Dolorossa*. Mr. Allison has entered the most sacred shrine in Kentucky and has misrepresented what he saw. As stated in my previous article I do not question his motives, but the facts remain.

It has long been a failing of non-Catholic romanticists and historians to go within the sacred portals of the Catholic Church, and misunderstand and falsely portray the spirit and the facts of her institutions; and strange to say, these writers have excused themselves under the plea that they have paid a passing tribute to the deeds or heroes of the old Church.

I agree with a part of the concluding paragraph of Mr. Allison in which he writes: "The old Cathedral of St. Joseph has an atmosphere of sanctity, beauty and age all its own, without reference to any tawdry gilt associations with kings." A true and just tribute is this, and not the first from the pen of Mr. Allison! But the old Cathedral has the right to historical truth, whether this truth refers to kings or people. Such truth Mr. Allison has not given![2]

HENRY S. SPALDING, S. J.

2 In this paper I have omitted several minor details of the controversy. If the reader wishes to go further into the subject, he is referred to the exhaustive and scholarly article by Rev. William Pike in the *Illinois Catholic Historical Review*, January, 1926. Father Pike analysed and answered every argument of Mr. Allison. As far as I know, Mr. Allison has made no attempt to reply. In my opinion the clear expositions of Father Pike cannot be answered.

DOCUMENTS

During November several important pronouncements were made which seem to us too valuable to pass into oblivion. Hence we have reserved this section of the REVIEW to ensure them the publicity which they deserve. Three of them were pronounced on the historic occasion of Right Rev. Monsignor James Hugh Ryan's Installation as Rector of the Catholic University of America on November 14th; the others were delivered on the occasion of the transfer of the remains of Very Rev. Dr. Thomas J. Shields, founder of Sisters' College at the Catholic University of America. The pronouncements have a decided historic value.

ADDRESS OF HIS EMINENCE CARDINAL O'CONNELL

The Catholic University of America is one of the very youngest of that great family of centers of learning, whose origin stretches back to the Middle Ages—whose birth was blessed by great and learned Popes—and whose charters were endorsed by the civil rulers of their time, whether emperors, kings or presidents.

The Alma Mater of all the great Christian schools from Bologna, Padua, Paris and Oxford to Washington was Sancta Mater Ecclesia. The most beneficent and powerful founders and protectors of the schools, whether popular or of the highest grade, were the Popes, fathers of Christendom. Ever-conscious of their divine commission to go forth and teach, they have been not only the common fathers of all the nations during all the centuries but the promoters of everything that was surest and sanest and soundest in the whole wide world of Christian civilization and the refinement of Christian influence.

Their first care, naturally, was the propagation of the faith, the truth which comes from God; but that never prevented them from giving the freest scope and encouragement to the cultivation and the study of all truth, human as well as divine. And so not only theology, but the humanities and law and medicine and literature and the fine arts and all the various branches even of experimental science, made their home in the great centers of learning, founded and endorsed by Popes and Cardinals and Bishops in nearly every land wherever the faith was preached.

FACTS ARE PLAIN

For reasons obvious enough to an impartial eye, this story of the founding of the schools of Europe and of America, especially South America has been deliberately obscured, ignored, minimized. But the facts were so plain that no modern historian, who respects his own reputation for truth, now hesitates to proclaim it from the house-tops.

Every student of the history of human learning realizes quite well that even universities may have their fads and fancies and that from time to time mere suppositions and conjectures, which are nothing but theories in the end, are seized upon with the frenzy of an enthusiasm worthy of a better cause and raised to the dignity of a dogma.

Those of us who have known something of this state of affairs, even in our own time, can remember the widespread excitement which the unproven statements of a few pseudo-scientists have aroused, not among the real scientists themselves, but among what might be called the camp followers of science. And we realize well also, how today, these very theories have been utterly disproved and cast into the discard. They were the momentary ebullition of minds too close to their work and without the balance which a great tradition and a clear perspective always give to knowledge.

DANGER OF NOVELTIES

The Catholic centers of learning in their time have naturally been brought into contact with this; but the keen mind of the Church, enjoying as she does such an age-long experience in these matters, stood calmly by, gently warning the enthusiasts of the danger of yielding to novelties without foundation, saved both teachers and scholars and the world at large from the craze of every new fantastic theory, and biding her time, kept clear and true the stream of knowledge through all the centuries.

In those moments of premature exaltation, caused by fervor with little reason behind it, the Church has had to take her share of derision, as standing in the way of progress. The Church knows very well the difference between progress by guess work and advancement on the solid ground of revelation, tradition and reason—and she is always perfectly content in these trying moments to wait till the shouting dies down, as it always does, when the real scholars, scientific and impartial, at last discover that what for the moment appeared a fixed star in the firmament was not even a meteor; but a rather distracting display of mental fireworks. This same experience is repeated century after century during which the Church, conservative yet always conservatively progressive, remains on firm ground unmoved by any passing spectacular performance. And those who sincerely love real knowledge, fully cognizant of her position, turn to her as the great Alma Mater of all true learning.

The Catholic Church is a devoted mother and above all else she is anxious about giving correct guidance and direction to the minds of her children. She takes an active part in supervising and wisely directing the chief courses of study in our schools and universities. And it is well that it is so;—for by this material kindness, our centers of learning are spared many a painful and bitter experience, which others, lacking in just this, have found to their cost to be of all too frequent occurrence.

MEN OF WIDE EXPERIENCE

Everyone knows that no more competent and authentic group of educators exists than the Congregation of Studies, whose head is the Pope himself and whose members are universally conceded to be men of widest experience and profound learning. And besides all this, whenever there is a question of examining a theory, a doctrine, or a principle of science, they have the finest experts in the world in all these branches at their disposal and beck and call to deliberate and decide upon what ought and what ought not to be taught as well-proven and well-grounded, sound and safe learning. Far from being a hindrance to any real

progress and education, this is of the very highest advantage and safeguards from momentary fads those institutions dedicated only to the knowledge and propagation of the truth. To any fair-minded and impartial witness, all this is a matter of history and of fact.

This Catholic University of America, though youthful in years, has the tremendous advantage unspeakable in its value of being founded by one of the most enlightened Popes the Church has ever had, the immortal Leo XIII, and is today under the watchful and loving care of the Pope whom all the world knows as an ardent lover of learning, Pius XI. It was established for the purpose of studying Christian truth and propagating what is known to be sound doctrine and true science. One of her chief missions is to reveal to America the true significance of the Church, the patient spiritual mother of the nations and the peoples. And no one, alas, who knows present day conditions will deny that America has not entirely understood, as yet, either the Church, or her divine and supernatural mission to all humanity, to every nation under the sun, and to this our own beloved land, our own America.

A SUPPORT FOR WELFARE

It is our hope that this institution, imbued with the most sacred love of Holy Church, as well as with the most deep and genuine affection for America, will in due time, make it clear to all fair minds that the Catholic Church, and all she has stood for through the centuries and all she stands for today, will now and in the years to come, be one of the strongest props upon which the continued welfare of America may lean with the most perfect security.

Never will any doctrine of disintegration or rebellion or destruction find a place within these halls. Here will be taught forever the glorious privilege of freedom under law. Here will be inculcated devotion to the nation. Here will be encouraged every sentiment of harmony and unity between citizen and citizen of this great republic, which depends so much upon the unity and harmony of its fellow citizens for the continuation of its very existence.

For these reasons and because we know and give our solemn pledge to all the world of the truth our patriotic sentiments, here taught and lived, I feel it a proud privilege to welcome to the Catholic University of America the presence of the President of these United States. Not once, but many times he has borne testimony of the fundamental truth that without religion there can be no government and that learning, unless inspired and sanctified by religion, is of small importance in the upbringing and the training and the formation of the future citizens of America.

Mr. President, for many years in our own beloved New England, we have stood upon the same platform before the citizens of whom you were the Governor and I was an humble Christian Bishop. Therefore, I have good reason to know that both as Governor of Massachusetts and President of the United States you have ever given valiant testimony of the need of faith in learning.

The Catholic University of America was founded upon this principle and with a heart full of admiration for your constancy in behalf of that same all-important doctrine. I and all the Board of Governors, the faculty and students of the Catholic University of America bid you a most hearty and loyal welcome.

ADDRESS OF RIGHT REV. MONSIGNOR JAMES H. RYAN

The Church has established a great University at Washington for two reasons. In the first place, this University concretizes our belief in the principle that science, philosophy, and religion must go forward together if a well-rounded and acceptable world-view is to prevail. As against theories which advocate intellectual separatism, this University represents the ideal of a unit truth, which unity, obscured at times, is achievable if men will but continue with patience and loyalty their search for unchangeable wisdom. Secondly, this University typifies the many-sided contributions which the Catholic Church is making, in a national way, to the complex life of our great Republic. Unlike some older universities, it was not founded simply to prepare men for the ministry. From its beginnings the objectives of the Catholic University were wider than that. The founders looked upon this University as a center of humanistic, scientific, and religious thought, a source from which would flow in every direction the vivifying currents of the best thinking in theology, philosophy, science, letter, politics, economics, and the law, to the upbuilding and quickening of the national life.

The great mediaeval universities were not clerical in the depreciatory sense of that word. They were catholic, that is, universal. No intellectual interest was foreign to their spirit of impartial investigation, no intellectual task too difficult for their inquiring pursuit. From out those schools went forth great summae, sublime literatures, scientific treatises, medical tracts and legal tomes. Professor Longwell writes that "the age which created Scholasticism in finished form was also producing mysticism and shaping humanism and beginning science."

Judged by their products, and not from an apriori point of view, the medieval universities were established much for the same reasons that modern universities are being built, for the investigation of truth and the spread of knowledge. Since Catholicism was the universally accepted religion, it was only natural that it should have controlled the religious thought of the medieval school. This, however, does not mean, as Professor Haskins has pointed out in his "Renaissance of the Twelfth Century," that academic freedom was denied teachers in these universities, or that scholars were hampered in their researches. On the contrary, if we except the realm of revealed religion upon which there was universal agreement, it is safe to assert that at no time in the world's history were men so intellectually free as they were in medieval times. The thirteenth was supremely a century of reason, so much so that we today, accustomed as we are to the utmost liberty in speculation, are astonished when history, fairly and accurately written, reveals the lengths to which the spirit of rationalism drove the medieval thinker.

It is not without reason that the Catholic University of America has been linked up so closely with the great mediaeval universities. We are the direct heir of those famous institutions of the past; our parentage is one and the same.

POPE LEO XIII FOUNDED IT

The Popes founded those great schools—a Pope, Leo XIII, founded this University and his successors have continued among its benefactors and supporters. Underlying present-day education are the philosophical principles which

actuated mediaeval culture, a philosophy whose applicability to contemporary thought and its problems is no less possible than it was seven centuries ago. The connection of the Catholic University with the past lies mainly in this, that we accept the philosophy and religion of which Paris, Oxford, Salamanca and Bologna were such striking formulations; our hopes for the future are based on unswerving loyalty and devotion to these same principles.

ROOTED IN SOUND PHILOSOPHY

Rooted in a sound philosophy of life and dedicated to the development and perpetuation of the worthiest fruits of American thought and endeavor, this University has almost completed a half century of existence. She stands today as the embodiment of the best in Catholic educational theory and practice, conscious of her position of leadership, devoted to her tasks, and pledged to ever greater efforts looking toward the actualization of those high ideals which illumine her path, consecrate her efforts, and hold out a crown for her achievement.

One of the fundamental forces making for the development of the democracy in which we live is education. On no other subject have so many, and such contradictory, judgments been expressed. The ordinary man, at times even the professional educator, seems at sea as to the import of the attitudes which he assumes toward the educative process and its functioning.

PRINCIPLES OF SOUND EDUCATION

What we stand in need of, if democracy is to be preserved, is a secure grasp on the principles which underlie sound education. The immediate imperative is a restatement of our educational faith in terms of an acceptable philosophy. We need not only to restate our educational position; we must, first of all, rethink it, bringing educational practice into harmony with philosophical profession.

A lip service to education will not save democracy. If our philosophical attitude toward the State, law and Government is wrong, logically we may look for harmful educational practices. In such a case the school becomes but another instrument for indoctrinating the children of the nation in the false principles and ideals of dangerous political and educational theorists.

THE FUNCTION OF THE STATE

In every worthwhile philosophy the place and function of the State in education must be defined with clearness and exactness. A clear definition implies clear thinking. Such thinking has been rare among educational theorists. Imbued with the Hegelian philosophy, many have come to look on the State as a sort of super-organism to which must be accorded supreme rights in every sphere, including education. From out such ideals have risen State monopolies, so characteristic of European countries.

Historically, the American attitude has always been one of freedom of education. We have never subscribed to the nationalist theory, to what Belloc calls the philosophy of the "slave state," despite the efforts of a group of prominent educators to lead us in that direction.

On the contrary, the final interpreter of the Constitution, the Supreme Court, has recently declared that State monopoly of education is unconstitutional, that

in the American polity there exists a place for private educational endeavor, that the right of the parent to choose the type of education he wishes his children to have is inalienable and unassailable.

CHURCH PRIMARILY EDUCATIONAL

The Church has always viewed her mission as primarily educational, since unlike fraternal organizations, economic groups, or schools of philosophy, she regards herself as a militant society of men who not only accept a definite view of the world and of life, but are pledged to the diffusion of these beliefs, to the presentation of these doctrines to every type of mind.

Moreover, the Church has never looked upon religious education as a kind of purple patch to be tacked on to the ordinary curriculum, but as a prime necessity for all who accept her beliefs and as the foundation of the whole educational scheme.

Doctrines are not only to be taught, they are to be taught in a religious context, and by consecrated teachers. They are to be taught, too, so that the whole body of knowledge, human and divine, shall be brought into harmonious relations in its several parts, so that the interdependence of part on part shall be made manifest, and the unit character of truth itself become clear.

No one will assert that it is easy to mark off with precision the fields of science, philosophy and religion. Oftentimes the facts and principles of one impinge on a neighboring field. Moreover, the efforts of scientist, philosopher, and theologian are devoted to extending, in as far as possible, their respective fields of investigation.

There is no unalterable opposition, however, between science and philosophy, or between philosophy and religion. Conflicts arise, but they are due in large part to misunderstandings which solve themselves with the passage of time. The true scholar, no matter to what realm of investigation his life is devoted, follows after the vision of unity, a bright clear light ever beckoning him upwards, until such time as he may attain the portals and enter into complete possession of the truth.

NO ELEMENTS SLURRED

And a university which looks beyond the phenomenal, the changing, the manifold of this workaday world into the stable, unchanging unity which holds all partial truths together, is a university which points the way toward a view of the universe in which none of the elements which go to make up its varied nature and activities is slurred, a view whose all-inclusiveness will find a proper place for the approved results of science, the accepted teachings of philosophy, and the revealed doctrines of Christian belief.

Fortunately a new consciousness has been born in our own times of the need of religious training for all. Democracy has not only brought into existence a recognition of the truth that all men should have an equal opportunity to be educated; it has convinced us that every man, as a son of God, has the right to be educated religiously.

Never before did men so ardently desire the fruits which only a deep religious life can bring forth; never before have the nations looked forward with such hopeful expectancy to a condition wherein all men may live in peace and fellowship as befits the members of a universal brotherhood.

WHAT PRESIDENT COOLIDGE SAID

Need I point out that for the fulfillment of such aspirations there is but one course open to mankind? History testifies to the truth of the assertion that we need never look for salvation, individual, national, or societal, in an education completely divorced from religion.

President Coolidge has said that "the thing which the world needs most is a proper spiritual conception of human relationships." I venture the statement it is precisely such proper conception of human personality, both abstractly and in its manifold practical relations to the world in which we live, that we are in a position to give to America thought, that the peculiar contribution of this University to American life will be found in the doctrines of the individual's worth and of his place in society which we teach.

SPIRITUAL TRANSCENDS SCIENCE

Certainly, it is not to political, economic, or scientific theorists that we are to turn for a full elucidation of the meaning of human relationships. The spiritual, by its very definition, transcends the realm of science. Properly it lies within the province of the ethical and religious thinker to say what human personality means and to define the attitude of person to person, of group to group.

The American people is possessed of unbounded energy and initiative. They need no stimulus to the pursuit of material happiness; they do need to pause at times in order to ask whither they are going.

If our national life is to endure, sound ethical values must be established, correct principles of action must be formulated, outcomes must be tested in the crucible of high and noble ideals.

DEMOCRACY EXAMINES CONSCIENCE

A democracy must be constantly examining its conscience, for it is as true of the nation as of each man's spiritual life, that it profits us nothing if we gain the whole world and lose our own souls.

Democracy it at bottom a religious ideal; for democracy is the political expression of the divine commandment of love, and love is, in the last analysis, freedom. Present-day America needs to ponder this profound truth.

Now, human life to be viewed totally must be considered from the moral and religious side. The relations, too, of human beings to one another must be studied morally and religiously.

Morality is as necessary for the reasoned continued existence of the universe as are the laws of physics, chemistry and biology. But who is to interpret the laws of justice, the concepts of right and wrong, who is to set the standards by which the individual and the nation are to judge their actions?

WHENCE THE AUTHORITY?

All are in agreement as to the existence of a moral imperative, but who is to define the common standards of morality or to point out the source from which these standards receive their justification?

If education is world-building, it should not fail to take religion into account, and especially that religion which represents the full flowering of revealed truth. The cause of truth is not served by closing one's eyes to Christianity, nor is the value of science and philosophy enhanced by failure to take cognizance of the position which Christianity occupies in the thoughts of millions.

If we are to build a new world through education, can it be constructed by ignoring these rules of action by which Western civilized nations have lived and live even today? Only in a union of the moral and religious can we hope to find that definitive, complete, and perfect correspondence between belief and act which the Divine plan of the universe logically requires.

WHAT THE UNIVERSITY DOES

An institution whose atmosphere is Christian, whose objectives are determined by reason of their religious character and influence, is in a position to solve correctly the problems of human relationships, whether of individuals or of nations. An education which regards the fields of science, philosophy and religion as merging one into the other, which views the contributions of each as complementary to all the rest, which sees in the practical applications of religious truth an aid to scientific and philosophical advance, is not likely to err in determining the rights of the individual, his duties to self, to country and to God.

WILL DO THEIR PART

The founders have set such ideals before us. It is the task of the rector and the professoriate of this University to see to their realization.

In accomplishing this, our high destiny, we shall not only be doing our part in the construction of a sound philosophy of action; we shall continue to infuse into American life those elements of moral and religious strength, coupled with philosophical accuracy and scientific knowledge, which have contributed so much to its upbuilding and to its present admirable condition.

ADDRESS ON BEHALF OF THE ALUMNI BY MR. CLARENCE E. MARTIN OF MARTINSBURG, W. VA.

Mr. President, Your Eminences and Prelates, Your Excellencies, Most Reverend Chancellor and Right Reverend Rector:

Here at the Catholic University of America, situated at the Nation's capital, we are gathered to fittingly welcome and formally install the fifth Rector of this great institution. It is, indeed, an auspicious occasion.

In the presence of the President of the United States and of official America; inspired by the members of the diplomatic corps; encouraged by the representatives of learned societies and educational institutions of the country; invigorated by the members of the American hierarchy; surrounded by men of

Catholic thought and action; supported, too, by the faculty, alumni, students and friends of this institution; under the admiring eyes of your beloved mother; you have publicly assumed, Right Reverend Rector, the responsibilities incident to leadership of Catholic education in America.

Founded to fill a want in the national life of America and provide a keystone in the arch of Catholic education, in less than half a century the Catholic University of America has justified its existence. Universities count their age in centuries, not in years; yet this institution in a remarkably short space of time, has won the admiration and respect of the educational realm at home and abroad. Every ideal of its founders, every standard adopted for its government, every plan suggested for its development, has been engendered by motives of the highest and noblest character.

In its reachings, there has been no innovation—the truths asserted, the philosophy taught, the substantive facts of science inculcated, have been those of the ages. Conservatism, one is compelled to concede, has reigned supreme. Yet, as the mind never rests save to deteriorate, so this University has ever been in the vanguard of intellectual progress. Substantial contributions have been made by its members to the cause of religion, to the development in the social world, and to the discoveries and inventions of the scientific field.

Few institutions have been blessed with a stronger faculty than this one. Men of renown, illustrious scholars and specialists, have filled its chairs. Throughout its existence they have shown a spirit of loyalty and coöperation certainly unexcelled, if equalled, anywhere.

To direct the work of these distinguished men and to preside over the destinies of this institution is an eminent honor. This distinction has been held by four other men only—Keane, the administrator; Conaty, the preacher; O'Connell, the philosopher; and Shahan, the historian. All of them, save Bishop Keane, were mitred by the Holy See, because of their work here, and two of them died as archbishops in the service of the American Church. The excellence of their work is best exemplified by the results each of them accomplished. And none of them deserves greater praise than your immediate predecessor—Bishop Shahan.

The University to him has been a life's work; he has seen it grow from one building to the present number; he has observed its land holdings increase four fold; an ecclesiastic, he has effectually aided the development of an undergraduate department for laymen; he has nurtured and assisted a kindred and subordinate college for the religious women of the land; he was one of the founders of Trinity. He has been as unsparing in toil as he has been unlimited in enthusiasm. No task has been too great for him to undertake. He has not only been a builder of buildings; but, in the best sense, a builder of men. An ideal professor, a scholar of extraordinary proportions— his pen has been mighty, his voice strong, in defense of the eternal Truth. He deserves the rest he seeks. He leaves the active management of the University with the sincere regret of all of us. He had our respect in our student days; he has had and will continue to have our love and affection.

The alumni of the University, scattered throughout the country, are now numbered in the thousands. The success that many of them have attained

is concrete evidence of the thorough training they received while students here. Into each of them, the University inculcated the primary principle of the duty of man to his God. Each of them has gone forth thoroughly imbued with the maxims of the Roman law, proclaimed centuries ago by Justinian: "To live honestly, to hurt no one, to give everyone his due." And each of them has been urged to forever maintain a love for law, to foster a respect for governing power, and to adhere to and defend the fundamentals upon which rest American institutions and liberty.

It is in behalf of these alumni, that I speak. The good wishes of each of them is presented to you, Right Reverend Monsignor, to-day. On their behalf, I extend to you their sincere congratulations and welcome you as our leader. You come not as a stranger. You have an intimate knowledge and a keen perception of the traditions and ideals of the University. You have an adequate vision of its needs. You have been a member of its faculty; you are fully cognizant of the ambitions of its friends. It was because of these things, coupled with your ability as a leader and your intellectual attainments, that the Board of Trustees asked the Holy See to confirm your elevation from the chair you held to that of the office of Rector. That you were selected is the best evidence of your capability. The honor sought you. The University is complimented by your acceptance of it.

There is entertained by all of us a firm conviction to a moral certainty, as the lawyers say, that you will justify the reliance your previous record has inspired. The future, golden in opportunity, lies before you. The work is stupendous; the responsibility onerous. Every trustee, teacher, student and alumnus is your well wisher. All willingly accept your assumption of authority, positive of your success.

The alumni, then, are glad to publicly assert their confidence in you, Right Reverend Rector, and to assure you of their assistance and coöperation in the years to come. Again we congratulate you.

ADDRESS OF REV. DR. GEORGE W. JOHNSON

THOMAS EDWARD SHIELDS

On a bleak February day, some eight years ago, the mortal remains of Thomas Edward Shields were consigned to the earth, the while the Church prayed that eternal rest be the portion of his immortal soul. On the face of things, here was just another evidence of the tragedy that hovers over human existence. A man labors mightily for things that are high and noble only to the cut down midway in his career, his dreams unfulfilled, his tasks scarce begun. Unusual though his talents may be, brave his resolves and large his accomplishments, inexorably comes the day when "the dust returns into its earth from whence it was, and the spirit returns to God who gave it."

Yet, the grave of Dr. Shields, to those who knew him and understood his work, was not a thing of doom and tragedy. His sepulchre was glorious, not only in the sense that the sepulchre of every Christian is glorious, through the Resurrection of Our Lord and Saviour, but likewise in this, that his influence promised to be greater in death than it had been in life. Of any great leader

it can be truly said that he was born out of due time. In the perspective of years, posterity has a better instrument for appraising a man's true worth, than any possessed by his contemporaries.

The intervening years, few though they have been, bear increasing witness to the fact that the life of Dr. Shields has not been destroyed, but changed. He planted a seed which is steadily developing into a great tree. His point of view, which when first enunciated may have seemed bizarre and impracticable, pervades the whole of Catholic educational thought today. Any future historian of Catholic education in the United States must view his career and his labors as the turning point in the progress of our schools.

The mission of Dr. Shields was a providential one. At the time of his appearance on the scene, the zeal of bishops, the labors of pastors, the self-sacrifice of religious, the enthusiasm of the laity, had combined to create a great system of schools, from kindergarten to university, supported on a voluntary basis and dedicated to the great principle enunciated by the First Provincial Council of Baltimore "that it is absolutely necessary that schools should be established, in which the young may be taught the principles of faith and morality, the while they are being instructed in letters." The Church could never approve of an educational arrangement which considers religion a non-essential, an extra-curricular activity. On the contrary, she regards it as the very foundation of all true education, the heart and soul of the curriculum. The educational policy of the state having drifted into the way of non-sectarianism, and the principle of no public support for religious schools having been accepted, there was no alternative for the Church, but to fall back on the loyal generosity of her children and to establish her own schools.

Great external activity always interferes with internal self-appraisal. In their zeal for the extension of the privileges of Catholic education, our leaders had little time to devote to thought concerning its intention. It is true, they were always conscious of great fundamental principles, principles based on a true concept of human destiny and of the nature of man. But it was not always easy to reduce fundamental principles to the specific terms of pedagogical practice. There was a tendency to adopt, for the most part, the curricula and the textbooks of the public schools on the assumption that the religion hour, the atmosphere of the school, and the personality of the teacher would win them for Christ.

Dr. Shields saw the danger that lurked in this manner of procedure. He sensed an unfortunate cleavage in the curriculum of the Catholic school that was interfering with the development of solidity, integrated Christian character. Moreover, there was always the danger of an increasing secularism in our schools, since the power of the world is overweening and cannot be withstood by merely negative means. He saw the need of a Catholic philosophy of education, of an expression of the Catholic philosophy of life in terms of the classroom. Furthermore, he realized the necessity of embodying this Catholic philosophy of education in curricula and textbooks, in details of administration and supervision, in teacher-training and school policy, were it to become really effective in the lives of the learners. He knew that Catholic education differs not just accidentally, but substantially from secular education, that the super-

natural is not the natural, that no man can serve two masters, that the choice must always be between Christ and the world. His vision was of a Catholic school system which would direct the children unto the doing of the truth in charity, that they might grow up to the Head, even unto Christ.

Accordingly, it was upon Jesus Christ, the Son of God, that he based his pedagogy. His curriculum was the Word made Flesh, the Figure and the Substance of the Father, the Way, the Truth, and the Life. "All things were made by Him, and without Him was made nothing that was made." The perfection of the world will come when all things are re-established in Him, when the hearts of men shall be brought subject to His power. Whatever there is that is worth while in science, or human institutions, or literature, or art, belongs to Him and should lead to Him and from Him receive validity and light. Truth is one and is centered in Him who is the author of truth.

To the Saviour he likewise turned for his methodology and discovered in the Gospels, the true principles of pedagogy. He who made the mind respected the laws of its development. It is from the Model Teacher, that Dr. Shields would have us learn how to teach. His own researches in the fields of biology and psychology, yielded him deeper insight into the Methods of Our Saviour. He saw in the Gospels an exemplification of all the laws that modern scientific education has established. Jesus taught, not with the view of imparting more information and instruction, but to change the hearts and minds of His hearers. His was not a mere intellectual appeal, but essentially an appeal to the will. His aim was not knowledge about His Message as an end in itself, but such knowledge as a means to the practice of virtue. "He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me." We learn to live, by living, and we become Christians by striving to live the life of Christ.

It was for the little ones of Christ that Dr. Shields formulated his message. "Suffer little children to come unto Me for such is the Kingdom of Heaven." He accepted the child as he found him, selfishly dependent upon his parents for the necessities of life, for love, for food, for protection, and for a model to imitate, and oppressed by the fear that is bred of selfishness. His aim was to transform this selfish dependence upon father and mother into that dependence upon God which is unselfish and which casts out fear. He revealed to the little mind the vision of God as his Father, loving him, feeding him, protecting him, providing him with remedies for all his ills, and through His Only Begotten Son showing him how to live.

The love that the child receives from his parents gives him a basis in experience for understanding the great truth that God loves him. The Eternal Creator whose care pursues even the birds of the air, will surely take care of the child who is worth so much more. Love inspires love, and courage is born of the realization that "underneath are the Eternal Arms." This sense of dependence upon God as upon a sure foundation generates that faith which overcomes the forebodings of self-love, and makes it possible for the child to profit by the great secret which the Son of God brought from Heaven and exemplified in His own life, the secret of love for one another. The child is inspired to follow the example of the Son of God, to think more of giving than of receiving, to become the source of love, of food, of remedy, of protection and

example for others. Thus the truth of the words that he reads in his little book is established by his own experience. "Joy grows in his heart like a beautiful flower and fills his life with sweetness."

The power that there is in this method, and its essential rightness can be attested by those of us who have utilized it and watched the transformation it has wrought in the lives of the children. Because of Dr. Shields, thousands of children have known the joys of intimate living with Jesus Christ in the first years of their schooling. They have experienced the love of Jesus. Could anything better insure their final perseverance?

No one knew better than Dr. Shields, that the teacher makes the school. The best of curricula and the finest of textbooks must fail of their purpose, when the teaching is incompetent. But it was not mere professional incompetence that he feared. Much more dangerous is the incompetence born of a lack of a fundamental Catholic philosophy of education. The Catholic teacher cannot be prepared for her task under auspices that are strangers to Christ, if not definitely hostile to His spirit. Consequently he labored tirelessly in the formulation of the religious teacher, and by book and lecture, by institute and summer school, strove to make the teaching sisters of the Catholic Church in America, conscious of their true mission and all that it implies. Finally, as the high point in his endeavors, he established the Catholic Sisters' College. And here it is eminently fitting that he should come home to rest, to be enshrined in the heart of the institution he loved so well. Here his tomb will ever serve as a symbol of his mission, an inspiration to those who are destined to carry on his work, a reminder of the gratitude that is due and which can be paid in prayer.

The ultimate test of a priest's work is the measure in which he has brought people closer to God. For this is after all the basic function of the Priesthood, to bridge the gap between creature and Creator. A priest who has labored in season and out of season to make Catholic schools more truly Catholic, who has not been too proud to stoop to the little ones that they might be kept closer to the Sacred Heart of Jesus, who has waged relentless war against the forces of secularism that threatened to engulf our religious teachers, who spent himself and shortened his life in the cause of Christian education, surely deserves the encomium, "Sacerdos Magnus." That he may hear it shortly, if he has not already heard it, from the lips of the Master, is our loving prayer for him this day.

CHRONICLE

The installation of Right Rev. Monsignor James Hugh Ryan, S.T.D., Ph.D., as Rector of the Catholic University of America on November 14, was an event of unusual brilliancy. The ceremony took place in the gymnasium which was elaborately decorated with American and papal colors. Three cardinals, nearly one hundred prelates, and several diplomatic representatives together with a large gathering of representatives of Sister Institutions participated. What lent special interest to the function was the presence of President and Mrs. Coolidge, who were in academic costume.

More than 3,000 persons crowded the gymnasium at the Catholic University of America to witness the inauguration and the conferring of the honorary degree Doctor of Law upon President Calvin Coolidge.

Despite that admission to the exercises was by ticket only, the auditorium, made brilliant by the flags of many nations, with the American and Papal colors predominant, was beginning to fill as early as an hour before the ceremonies started.

Among the earliest arrivals of the distinguished guests occupying places on the platform were Attorney General Sargent, Justice Pierce Butler of the United States Supreme Court, the Belgian Ambassador and Princess de Ligne, the Italian Ambassador and Signora de Martino, the Argentine Ambassador and Senora Malbran, the Cuban Ambassador, Admiral and Mrs. William S. Benson and General Tasker H. Bliss.

Virtually every seat in the gymnasium had been taken when, about a half hour before the commencement of the ceremonies, the brilliant academic procession, participated in by representatives of more than 70 universities and learned societies, distinguished public figures and the Archbishops and Bishops, entered the hall. This procession made its way to the stage, where the participants took their places in tiers of seats, their many-colored gowns and impressive robes giving a frame to the exercises that followed.

A flourish of trumpets, the playing of "Hail to the Chief!" by the United States Marine Band Orchestra and a wave of applause told of the entrance of President and Mrs. Coolidge, Monsignor Ryan, the Cardinals and others.

The applause grew into a real ovation as the party ascended the platform. The President in cap and gown, walked with William Cardinal O'Connell, Archbishop of Boston. Mrs. Coolidge, also in cap and grown, walked with Dennis Cardinal Dougherty, Archbishop of Philadelphia. They were followed by Patrick Cardinal Hayes, Archbishop of New York; the Most Rev. Pietro Fumasoni-Biondi, Apostolic Delegate to the United States; the Most Rev. Michael J. Curley, Archbishop of Baltimore, and Monsignor Ryan.

The Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edward A. Pace, Vice-Rector of the University, served as master of ceremonies, and when "The Star Spangled Banner" had been played, he introduced the Rt. Rev. Joseph Chartrand, Bishop of Indianapolis, who pronounced the invocation.

Cardinal O'Connell then extended to the President, on behalf of the Board of Governors, the faculty and the student body of the Catholic University of America, "a most hearty and loyal welcome."

Monsignor Pace, speaking immediately after the Cardinal, read the following:

"In recognition of merit, the University not only confers academic honors on those who have won distinction within its halls; but it also pays tribute to those who through a wider experience and a deeper reflection are qualified to teach their fellowmen, by word and deed, the meaning and value of knowledge, its significance for the performance of duty in public and in private life and the consequent need, for genuine education, of lifting the thought of men to the Source of wisdom and truth.

"Such lessons are the more impressive when taught by one whose exalted station, grave responsibility and acquaintance with the needs of the people enable him, and entitle him, to give him wholesome council.

"Accordingly it is my privilege, in the name of the Academic Senate of the University to present for the degree of Doctor of Law honoris causa the foremost citizens of our country and therefore of the world, His Excellency the President of the United States."

The audience stood, applauding. President Coolidge took a step or two forward until he was in the very center and front of the platform. Archbishop Curley, the Chancellor of the University, waiting until the applause had subsided, presented the President with the degree.

The President did not speak, but returned to his place and resumed his seat beside Mrs. Coolidge, with Cardinal O'Connell on his left, while the audience again applauded.

Archbishop Curley again spoke, this time reading in Latin the degree appointing Monsignor Ryan Rector of the University. When he had finished he presented the "mandate" to the Monsignor, who then delivered his inaugural address, which appears elsewhere.

A tablet commemorative of the wonderful service which Monsignor Edward A. Pace, vice-rector of the Catholic University of America, has rendered to the International Federation of Catholic Alumnae was unveiled at the Sisters College of the University on Saturday afternoon, December 8.

The exercises followed upon the dedication of the Mary Memorial Altar at the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception on the University campus. Members of the International Federation of Catholic Alumnae attended meeting.

The tablet in the Sisters College will also commemorate the establishment by the Alumnae of the $10,000 Sisters' Scholarship at the college.

This scholarship will be known as the Monsignor Edward A. Pace scholarship and is a recognition of the wise guidance and great help which Monsignor Pace as spiritual director of the Federation has given to the organization.

Monsignor Pace presented the check for $10,000 to the Sisters College. Mrs. Harry M. Benzinger of Baltimore, former President of the International Federation and Chairman of the Education Fund of the Federation presented the tablet to the college and a handsome volume, containing the names of all contributors to the fund, to Monsignor Pace.

This volume is bound in blue kid. Blue is the color of the Federation, and signifies devotion to the Blessed Mother.

The fund for the scholarship was inaugurated by Mrs. Benzinger and collected by her. The scholarship will be used by a member of one of the religious sisterhoods who has received a degree of Bachelor of Arts or higher and who wishes to take a still higher degree at the University.

Professor Carlton Hayes, head of the Department of History at Columbia University, recently addressed the graduate group of the Newman Club on "The Historicity of the Gospels."

He showed that for centuries the Gospels had been accepted as history, and it was not until comparatively recently that there was any question of their validity.

A generation ago, however, quite radical critics even went so far as to deny the existence of any such historical character as Christ. But the present trend among reputable historians, according to Professor Hayes, is back to the traditional viewpoint of accepting the Gospels as historical and probably written about the time previously assigned to them.

A Catholic missioner was invited to attend a conference of the American Council of Learned Societies on December 1, in New York City, and which discussed the best means of carrying out a survey of sinological studies. The Catholic missioner was a Maryknoll priest, the Reverend Anthony Cotta, A. F. M. Before joining the Maryknoll Society, Father Cotta, was for a number of years a missionary in China and Madagascar. He is the author of a Madagascar Grammar and Dictionary and speaks fluently French, English, Chinese, Arabic and Syriac.

Among the sinologists attending the conference were Nelson T. Johnson, Assistant Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.; Stanley K. Hornbeck and Willys R. Peck, Department of State, Washington, D. C.; Professors Henry Courtenay Fenn, L. Carrington Goodrich, Lewis Hodous and John C. B. Kewi of Columbia University; Professor Kenneth Scott Latourette of Yale University; Edward Hicks Hume, President of the Graduate School of Medicine, New York City, and former President of Yale-in-China; Professors Paul Eugene Pelliot, Lucius C. Porter and A. Baron Stäel von Holstein of the Harvard-Yenching Institute; A. W. Hummel and Kiang Kang-Hu of the Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.; and C. W. Bishop, Curator of Oriental Art, Freer Gallery of Art, Washington, D. C.

The presence of Father Cotta at the conference constitutes an opportunity for contact between prominent sinologists of the United States and Catholic missioners in China who are distinguished linguists.

A Catholic priest, Abbé Henri de Genouilhac, has been appointed director of excavations at Tello, in Irak, joint enterprise of the Kansas City museum

and the museum of the Louvre. Abbé de Genouilhac sailed from Marseilles recently with two of his assistants.

Tello, situated on the site of the former Sumerian city of Lagash, is the ruin which has contributed the most information for the reconstruction of the history of the country of Sumer, the civilization of which reveals itself as the oldest in the world.

The Catholic Sisters College paid a final tribute to the memory of its founder, the Very Rev. Dr. Thomas Edward Shields, on November 20 when his body was translated from its temporary resting place in Mount Olivet Cemetery on the outskirts of the city to a beautiful mausoleum just erected on the college campus in Brookland. Representatives of the various religious houses at the Catholic University of America here and from various parts of the country, and a large congregation of the laity attended the ceremonies to manifest their esteem for the great American educator.

Preceding the services of re-interment, the Right Rev. Bishop Thomas J. Shahan, rector emeritus of the Catholic University of America, celebrated a Pontifical Mass of Requiem in the college chapel. The Right Rev. Monsignor George A. Dougherty, Procurator of the Catholic University, served as assistant priest, while the Rev. Daniel M. Dougherty and the Rev. Henry J. Gebhard, both of New York, were deacon and sub-deacon, respectively. The ceremonies were under the direction of the Rev. Dr. Edward B. Jordan, associate professor of education at the Catholic University, assisted by the Rev. James O'Hara of Scranton. The Mass was sung by a choir of twenty-two selected voices from the Pius X School of Liturgical Music, Manhattanville, N. Y., under the direction of Mrs. Justine Ward.

Lay students of the Catholic University of America were guests of Monsignor James H. Ryan, newly installed rector, at a dinner recently in the university dining-hall.

Monsignor Ryan expressed his appreciation of the loyalty he had found on the part of the lay students and besought his hearers to take full advantage of the opportunities offered by the school for a more general education, particularly along cultural lines.

Replies were made by Richard E. Carey for the graduates, Thomas F. Murphy for the senior class and undergraduates and John F. Bergin for the day students.

The Catholic world was shocked to learn the death of Ludwig von Pastor in Innsbruck on October 1, 1928. To many laymen this name will not have a wide significance, but to the academic world, it spells years of endeavor in a field which is one of the most important in the whole sphere of learning, that of historical research.

Ludwig von Pastor was born on January 31, 1854, in Aix-la-Chapelle in the Rhineland. He followed the courses at the noted University of Bonn from 1875 until 1878. He furthered his studies at the Universities of Berlin and Vienna.

In his early years his bent took the direction of historical research. His leading light in this field was Johann Janssen. Ever a true son of the Church, he was a fearless searcher for the truth, defending the Church at a time when she had to suffer so much from false historical representation.

In 1880, Pastor came to Innsbruck and assumed the position as sub-professor at the University. Two years later he married Constance Kaufman. From this happy union sprung five children, of whom two consecrated their lives to the service of God. In 1887, after having been promoted to a full professorship at the University, he began his earnest work in historical research.

Having, with success, filled the chair of history at the University of Innsbruck, Pastor was named the successor of Theodore Sickels as head of the Austrian Institute for Historical Research in Rome. This post he filled until the Institute was dissolved by the Italian Government. Recognizing his genius, Pope Leo XIII opened to him the secret archives of the Vatican. From this period on, he devoted his entire time to the work of historical research.

The choicest fruit of this period of his life is his *History of the Popes*. It is a work which gained for him not only a name, but also a place among the foremost of modern historians. In this monumental work, Pastor treats periods of Papal history which are extremely delicate, with a finesse which is remarkable and commendatory. He was a fearless worker and a tireless exponent of the truth. This work is acknowledged not only among Catholics as most reliable, but also among those who count themselves our opponents in the field of history.

Among his other works may be mentioned, *The Decrees of the Inquisition*, *Letters of Johann Janssen*, *Sixtus V*, and *The Frescoes of the Sistine Chapel*. All of his works show a clear and concise German style, sacrificing learned phrases for the sake of clarity.

In the year 1909, he was honored in a special manner by the late Emperor of Austria, Francis Joseph I, who conferred upon him the noble rank. In 1916 he was given a baronetcy. As a mark of special distinction, Pastor was sent as Austrian Ambassador to the Holy See, which post he filled with credit until his death. This distinction was especially dear to him. A few days before his death he sent a most touching message to the Holy Father. In it he offered the last beat of his failing heart for the Holy Catholic Church and the Papacy.

We are assured by Messrs. Herder of St. Louis, Mo. that Pastor's remaining studies on the Papacy will appear in due course both in German and in an English translation.

Rev. Dr. Gerald Shaughnessy, the author of *Has the Immigrant Kept the Faith* says in the *N. C. W. C. Bulletin:*

The results of the 1926 compilation of religious statistics of the country by the United States Census Bureau are now gradually being made public although it will probably be several months yet before the two volume report *Religious Bodies—1926* issues in complete form from the press.

Before commenting on the figures relating to the Catholic Church it may be well to note that this compilation of religious statistics is in reality not a census at all although it is in charge of the Census Bureau. Contrary to the

actual facts there seems to be a rather general impression throughout the country that it is the result of a regular census taken up in the same manner as is the usual general population census occurring decennially at the beginning of each decade.

In 1850, 1860, 1870 and 1890 the Government in its regular census, compiled some statistics on religion—chiefly the number of churches, their seating capacity and value. In 1890, a departure was made and membership statistics were also compiled. In 1900, religious questions were not asked by the census takers because considerable and rather widespread opposition had developed against this "incursion of the State into the realm of religion."

A substitute method was adopted, however, and in accordance with an act of 1902, and its amendment of 1906, the Census Bureau compiles decennially, as of the sixth year of the decade, religious statistics, not by taking an actual census, but by means of questionnaires sent to church authorities throughout the country. The statistics that are now being issued by he Government are, in other words, not really Census Bureau figures but simply the returns sent to the Bureau by the various denominational authorities in 1927 and tabulated by the Bureau.

The Government, then, is not responsible for these statistics nor is any guarantee as to their accuracy given by, nor under the circumstances, to be expected from the Census Bureau. The value of these statistics, in a word, is to be gauged by the methods used by the church authorities in originating them, the care with which they are taken up. Actually the method of original compilation varies with the denominations and even with ecclesiastical divisions of the same denomination.

From the foregoing it must be concluded that it is quite unscientific to accept without question and as on the authority of the Census Bureau the religious statistics which it issues.

These statistics, so far as Catholic membership is concerned, are really merely the compiled estimates of individual pastors, which are, in turn, occasionally the result of a true parochial census, but more often merely an estimate. It is inevitable, too, that some errors should enter in when returns originally come individually from some 15,000 pastors. The margin of error and the degree of individual care are, naturally, factors incapable of determination under the circumstances.

Another obstacle with which the Census Bureau had to contend was the difficulty of arriving at a clear and uniform definition of the word "membership." Because "membership" is variously defined by different denominations—some limiting membership to those who have been admitted to communion—the Government in 1890 and 1906 applied this definition to Catholic membership and deducted 15 per cent from the Catholic returns in order not to count children before their first Communion. The purpose was to obtain a common definition of membership that should admit of comparison of the numbers reported by the various denominations.

Beginning with 1916, however, the Government has adopted the definition used by the respective denominations and in present-day statistics has restored the deducted 15 per cent to Catholic statistics for 1890 and 1906. Thereby, it

appears to the Bureau, greater uniformity is obtained than by the former method since the non-Catholic definition now no longer universally excludes children.

As a matter of fact, however, the word "Catholic," so far as statistical purposes are concerned, admits, even from the Catholic point of view, of various definitions and, as no central ecclesiastical authority issues any instructions as to what definition to follow, the resultant statistics cannot be said to have any solid basis since varying definitions will be followed by those who make returns to the questionnaires of the Government.

Thus everyone baptized in the Catholic Church is truly a Catholic—a member of the Catholic Church.

Few, if any, pastors adopt such a broad definition in compiling data on the membership of a parish. Ordinarily further qualifications are applied so that in one parish, for example, a person is enumerated if he at least makes his Easter duty and attends Mass regularly. In another parish, on the other hand, such a one would not be enumerated unless, in addition, he contributes regularly to the support of the parish.

Thus many distinctions can be, and are, drawn, in adopting a definition for statistical purposes. Again, in many city parishes, and the Catholic population at present is almost 80 per cent urban (situated in places of 2,500, or over, population), because of the circumstances of city life, possibly millions of devout, practising Catholics are not known personally to any priest and hence not enrolled on any parochial census list and therefore not accurately enumerated when returns are made to the Census Bureau. In addition, the numerous migrant and immigrant population of laborers and their families may remain unenumerated for years until their presence is definitely recognized in a locality and steps taken to provide for their ministration.

It is a necessary conclusion, in view of the foregoing considerations, that the Government announcement of the 1926 Catholic population as 18,604,850, as reported to the Census Bureau by the pastors and diocesan chanceries fails to include a large number of persons some of whom are actually practising Catholics and all of whom are at least enumerable as Catholics because they are such by birth, Baptism, early training and present tendencies and sympathies. In a word, they are in all except, perhaps, regular Mass attendance, reception of the Sacraments and support of the Church, members of the Faith. This is all the more true when comparison with the membership of other denominations is concerned for if only bona fide regular attendants at Protestant services were listed as members of their churches the Protestant enumerated membership would be materially decreased.

The Catholic Directory for 1927 gives as the 1926 Catholic population 19,483,296 or almost 900,000 more than the statistics which reach us from the same source used by the Directory but through the Census Bureau. The Directory figures themselves are admittedly an underestimate inasmuch as returns for many dioceses have been known to remain unchanged or practically so over a period of twenty years. Such statistics as are available, on immigration, natural growth and conversion, it is agreed by all who have undertaken to study the question seriously, point to the fact that there were in the United States in

1926 about 25,000,000 Catholics, including in this category the merely nominal as well as practising Catholics. If the merely nominal are excluded the number should perhaps be placed somewhere between twenty and twenty-two million.

The statistics, then, that are reported by pastors to the Government for publication by the Census Bureau are not completely accurate but notwithstanding this fact they contain matter for thought, and, since the inaccuracies are general and in all probability evenly distributed and, therefore, equalized, more or less valid conclusions can be drawn from a study of them. Furthermore, the Census Bureau through its questionnaires obtains from pastors certain data which are not available even in *The Catholic Directory*.

Perhaps the most interesting and possibly illuminating feature of the statistics thus published by the Census Bureau is that they give the distribution of churches and membership with regard to urban and rural districts. This is the only source available for information on this point. The Census Bureau states that in 1926 of the 18,939 Catholic Churches reporting, 7,869 were in urban territory, that is in towns or cities having 2,500 inhabitants or more, and 11,070 were in rural districts. Of the membership, 14,809,142 were in urban and 3,795,708 in rural sections. Expenditures as reported were $168,404,856 by the urban parishes and $36,118,131 by the rural.

When we state the foregoing in terms of comparison we thus see that 41.5 per cent of our churches are found in urban territory to serve 79.6 per cent of the Catholic membership of the country. Fifty-eight and five-tenths per cent of the churches are in rural territory serving 20.4 per cent of the membership. In the urban membership the expenditure was $11.37 per capita and $9.51 among the rural.

This merely confirms the well-known fact that the Catholic population is more predominantly urban than the total population of the country of which 51.4 per cent was found in places of 2,500 or more inhabitants in 1920. The comparison shows furthermore that the overhead, as it were, is greater in rural districts than in urban. Thus in the urban territory the average membership of a church is 1,882 while in the rural sections it is only 343. Because of the scattered population in the rural districts a disproportionate multiplication of churches is made necessary to care for them. Again the average urban parish investment is found to be $100,000 ($669,651,780 for 6,684 parishes reporting) while the average rural investment is $17,500 ($167,524,273 for 9,569 reporting).

While all parishes did not report on this item the proportion not reporting among urban and rural was about the same hence the margin of error is not great when we distribute this investment among the membership of the respective sections to find the per capita investment. By this method we find that the per capita permanent investment was $53.00 for the urban membership and $51.00 for the rural.

Similarly, as stated previously, the per capita urban annual contribution (the item of total expenditure is compiled for the first time by the Government in the present report) is $11.37 and the rural $9.51. If this last item is corrected to allow for the children (approximately 25 per cent of the membership) who cannot contribute, and for the greater proportion of unmarried workers among the urban population, it appears that the average per capita contri-

bution is very nearly the same for both the urban and the rural parishes—namely about $12.50. The "overhead" in the rural districts is disproportionately high for from practically the same per capita permanent investment and individual annual contribution the rural Catholic membership gets practically no return in the way of parochial schools and far less than the urban in the way of resident priests with all that such an item means to a parish.

Another interesting point covered is that of the parochial school. The inadequacy of the statistics reported to the Government in regard to Catholic schools is quite apparent when we compare the 5,256 schools and 1,720,504 pupils of the present compilation with the 6,995 school, and 2,167,241 pupils reported as of 1926 (namely, for the same year) in *The Catholic Directory* for 1927.

The civic contribution of Catholics by their support of parochial schools stands out prominently if we but compute roughly that the 7,000 schools mean an investment of perhaps $300,000,000 and the educating of over 2,000,000 pupils relieves the public schools of a burden and the tax payers of an annual bill for some eighty to one hundred million dollars. In Washington, the capital of the nation, for example, were the parochial schools to close, an impossible situation would be made even more so far as it is the public school pupils are on a part time schedule and under this plan there is, as reported by the daily press, at least one instance wherein one public school teacher is compelled to care for more than ninety pupils in one room.

There is another point, not so conducive to Catholic complacency, that an analysis of the statistics on parochial schools brings out, when we compare the number of parochial school pupils with the total number of Catholic children of school age. The compilation published by the Census Bureau does not touch this question but acceptable statistics are obtainable.

The number of children between the ages of 5 and 14 (approximately the school age) in the general population of the country usually constitutes about 20 per cent of the total population. Hence among the 18,604,000 Catholics reported in the pastoral returns made to the Government there are at least 3,720,000 children of school age. Of these, then, 1,720,000 are in the parochial schools and some 2,000,000 do not come under their influence.

Coming to the statistics for individual states the reports which were made to the Government present figures which are in many cases anomalous, to say the least. In fourteen States—Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Mississippi, Montana, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, Tennessee, Washington and Virginia—a decrease in the total number of churches is listed in the period from 1916 to 1926. According to *The Catholic Directory* an actual decrease did take place in three—Arkansas, Mississippi and Tennessee—due to the consolidation or suppression of more missions than there were new parishes established. In Mississippi and Tennessee the number of churches with resident priests increased, however, and in Arkansas it did not change. In the statistics for the other eleven States a strange result appears in the Government compilation, due perhaps to lack of consistency in terminology.

One example will suffice for all. The Government compilation according to the answers received in response to the Census Bureau questionnaires records a decrease from 398 to 328 in the number of churches in Montana from 1916

to 1926. *The Catholic Directory*, which is more apt to be official on this particular point, listed 202 churches in Montana in 1916 and 232 in 1926.

In accordance with the data received the Census Bureau lists a decrease in Catholic membership in five States—Alabama, Georgia, Montana, New Mexico and Oklahoma. In the case of Alabama, Georgia, and Oklahoma the Directory does not substantiate this result. In the case of New Mexico, for which the decrease is stated to be from 177,727 to 174,287, no Directory statistics can be adduced since the Directory does not give statistics by States, but only by dioceses, and a considerable portion of New Mexico is included in the diocese of El Paso, Texas. A decrease in New Mexico is, however, hardly credible since the Archdiocese of Sante Fe, which is composed of the greater part of the State, increased, according to the Directory, from 140,000 to 155,000 and the Diocese of El Paso from 81,000 to 100,000. Moreover it is a fact that many immigrants from Mexico have come to the State in the last decade.

That there was a decrease in the State of Montana (the dioceses of Great Falls and Helena) is corroborated by the Directory. The Government report lists a decrease of 4,000 (from 78,000 to 74,000) while the Directory gives the Montana Catholic population as 103,000 in 1917 and 74,000 in 1926, thus listing a decrease of 29,000 for the decade. Strangely, though in the Directory the decrease is attributed solely to the Helena Diocese, a small gain being recorded for that of Great Falls.

Conditions in the mining industry make it not improbable that the 71,000 of 1916, (the Directory figures for Helena) might represent the result of the World War influx into Butte and the surrounding section and the 41,000 of 1926 (the Directory report for Helena) might be explained as the result of a return to normal and even subnormal conditions in the mining industry. Thus we would have a possible explanation for the decrease if it really took place. It is interesting to note that the Government compilation indicates a steady decrease in the number of Catholics in Montana from 1906 to 1926, the figures for the three decadal years being 85,128, 78,113 and 74,224. Directory figures for these years on the number of churches in Montana (an increase in churches would rather belie a decrease in membership) are defective and misleading and evidently inadequate and no arguments can be deduced from this source. The Directory for 1909 listed 229 churches in Helena Diocese while for 1917 it lists 90 and for 1927 it lists 99. Here evidently is an out and out error such as is found also in the statement in the 1909 issue that there was a total of 53 priests in the diocese and at the same time 95 churches with resident priests, two facts plainly incompatible. Probably the source of these errors is the failure to take into account, in the Helena returns, the establishment of the See of Great Falls.

To conclude, an analysis and study of the Government compilation provides food for thought. The limits of this paper will not allow of further elaboration. Suffice it to say that in these statistics, faulty though they are in many respects, we can find a clear reminder that the Church has a rural problem; that there ought to be a far greater number of pupils in the parochial schools to-day; that the immigrant, the migrant, the Catholic, swallowed up and submerged in the caverns of city life that rob the faithful of personal contact with the Church

and her representatives, if he remains incognito long enough, tends also to become non-existent as a Catholic; that, in fine, there is a great work yet to be done despite the striking accomplishments that are to the credit of the Church in America.

No credence is placed here in the report that the Malines conferences are to be resumed.

The basis for the rumor, which was published by several newspapers, appears to be the presence in Belgium of Viscount Halifax. As Lord Halifax is nearly 90 years of age it was, presumably, concluded that he would not have made the journey to Belgium without some good purpose.

A Brussels message received here says that ecclesiastical authorities there state "there will be no resumption yet" of the conferences.

The development of priestly and religious vocations in Holland during the last fifty years is traced by Father Van Ginneken, S.J., last year's rector of the Nymegen Catholic University in an article contributed to the Annual of the Central Catholic Bureau of Education of The Hague.

In 1878, the article says, there were but 110 entrances into the seminaries for both the regular and the secular clergy—32 and 78 respectively. And in 1925 a total of 253 young men entered the seminaries of 17 religious orders and 114 the five diocesan seminaries.

Between the years 1907-1925, the congregation of the Divine Word at Steyl registered the greatest number of admissions to the theological course—477. The Warmond diocesan seminary of Harlem was second with 475 admissions. During that same period the Friars Minor received 374 theological candidates, the Jesuits 280, the Capuchins 213, the Dominicans 169, and the Redemptorists 131.

The annual meeting of the Bishops of the United States, held at the Catholic University of America in Washington on November 14 and 15, was attended by more than 70 members of the Hierarchy, including the four American Cardinals and was marked by discussions as interesting as any that have developed at these gatherings in recent years.

Mrs. Sigrid Undset, new Nobel prize winner in literature, is a convert to the Catholic faith and one of the most interesting figures in the European literary world. The mother of five children, Mrs. Undset dismissed reporters, who came to interview her, on her newly acquired honor, with the words, "Don't ask questions for I am going to put my children to bed."

Mrs. Undset gives all her time to her literary work and to her home. She grows rare flowers and takes an interest in folklore and in the Marionette theatre. Though only 46 years of age, she has long been acknowledged as one of the literary geniuses of Norway and her books have been among the best sellers in Europe. Of her latest novels 400,000 copies have been sold.

She is a daughter of a professor of archaeology, who died when she was young. Left penniless, she found work as a typist and devoted here spare time to writing. While still in her twenties her earnings from her books were sufficient to make her independent. While preparing her most noted work. "Kristin Lavransdatter," a novel in three volumes, she came in close contact with the Catholic religion and through it became a Catholic. The merits of her "Kristin Lavransdatter" brought her the Nobel award.

Her fortune from her literary work enabled her to build a spacious home in the old rural style near the village of Lillehammer, which is now her home.

Figures just made public in the eighth year book of the Central Catholic Educational Bureau of The Hague show that there are 3,658,797 Protestants of different sects and 2,444,583 Catholics in Holland. The Catholics make up 35.61 per cent of the population.

The Catholics of Holland have, in their own church schools, an attendance of 472,626. There are about as many pupils in the State and non-Catholic religious schools. Thus there are nearly a million students. What that means, is strikingly manifested when compared with the school figures for France, the area of which is sixteen times that of Holland. According to the Journal Official, the French schools registered in 1925 but 3,485,266 pupils.

Of the 472,625 attendants at the Catholic schools, there were 90,470 in the kindergartens in 1927 as against 87,582 in 1926; in the primary schools 360,918 against 345,731 of the preceding year, and in the secondary schools 6,079, instead of 5,944.

In the Dutch Indies there are in the elementary Catholic schools this year 1,362 children of European descent; 46,371 children of natives and 868 children of Chinese parents, an increase of 12,693 pupils for the three races.

The Osservatore Romano recently published letters exchanged, beginning with 1920, between Pope Benedict XV and Mr. Hoover, when he was head of American relief work in Europe.

The Pope wrote Mr. Hoover, at the suggestion of Cardinal Gibbons, praising his work as "really admirable" and as "the noblest place in the history of Christian charity and entitles you to the gratitude of the peoples." The Pope's letter also recalled the previous assistance Hoover had given to the children of Belgium and pointed to the new danger involving three million children of Central Europe.

Therefore, the Pope recommended the work being done by Mr. Hoover to the generosity of all American citizens without regard to faith or party, in the certainty that "American hearts, always open to every noble initiative, would enthusiastically respond to this appeal."

The Pope concluded by recalling the appeal he, himself, and made the preceding November to the bishops of the whole world, setting aside December 28, Feast of the Holy Innocents, as a day on which collections would be made in all churches for the children suffering the consequences of war.

Mr. Hoover's reply, dated Washington, March 2, 1920, was published by The Osservatore as follows:

"Your Holiness: With profound gratitude I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of the letter which Your Holiness has communicated to me through His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons. I assure you that I very highly appreciate your benevolent sentiments in my behalf for my efforts directed to relieve the misery of suffering Europe. At the same time I am full of gratitude for your words and works tending to feed millions of children in Central Europe. I have no doubt but that my fellow citizens will not fail to respond with their usual promptness and generosity to the cause of our appeal. With sentiments of profound admiration, I am, respectfully, Herbert Hoover."

During this exchange of letters, the present Pope, as Msgr. Ratti, was Papal Nuncio in Poland and often met Hoover, while engaged in relief work. Pope Pius, just previous to the recent election, mentioned these meetings and exhibited a photograph published in a pamphlet on his life, not long ago. The photograph was taken at Warsaw during a festival in 1920, and shows the present Pontiff seated between Marashal Pilsudski and Mr. Hoover.

Mr. Hoover also visited Pope Benedict, when he passed through Rome in 1920, being presented to His Holiness by Archbishop Cerretti, now Cardinal.

Despite these personal cordial relations a painful impression has been made in Rome by the wide use of anti-Catholic arguments against Governor Alfred E. Smith during the electoral campaign, from which, according to American tradition and law, every religious motive should be removed.

A large bronze bell has recently been cast at the foundry of the Mencely Bell Co. in Troy, N. Y. for shipment to the Passamaquoddy Tribe of Indians at Perry, Maine, to be installed in the belfry of the new brick chapel that is now in process of construction to replace the structure that was destroyed by fire in 1927.

The Passamaquoddy Indians have for centuries adhered to the Catholic faith.

There are now 21,453,928 Catholics in the United States according to the new issue of "The Catholic Press Directory," published by Joseph H. Meier, 64 West Randolph Street, Chicago.

Comparing these figures with those of 1908, namely, 15,265,168, the Directory shows that the Catholic Church in the United States proper has gained 6,188,760 in membership during the past twenty years.

During the last ten years the gain has been 2,295,995, for in 1918 the Catholic population figures stood at 19,157,933. Within the last three years the increase has been 715,481.

Mr. Meier's figures—21,453,928—do not agree with those recently made public by the Census Bureau of the Department of Commerce, but the Directory publisher points out that the Government did not take up an actual religious census, that is, there was no head-for-head count, and Mr. Meier says he feels sure that if such a count, or such a census, is ever undertaken by the Bureau, it will prove his case conclusively and show that his total is not exaggerated.

As the Press Directly total is much higher than that given out by the Census Bureau, the compiler explains that he has included in his calculation the non-registered and the so-called "floating" Catholic population.

Mr. Meier claims that in 1905, when he began his study of Catholic population statistics, the then Archbishop of St. Paul, the late Most Rev. John Ireland, explained to him how necessary and how important it was to include the non-registered and the "floating" population.

If an actual national religious census is ever taken, these non-registered and non-listed Catholics will report themselves as such, even though they do not appear on any parish registry.

The new issue of *The Catholic Press Directory* lists 291 Catholic papers and periodicals, all published in continental United States, and the combined circulation of the 248 publications which furnished circulation figures is 6,647,066. If figures were available for the other forty-three, at least a quarter of a million could be added to the total just mentioned.

The frequency of issue of the 291 papers and periodicals is as follows: Dailies, nine; thrice-a-week, one; semi-weeklies, three; weeklies, 106; thrice-a-month, one; semi-monthlies, nine; monthlies, 127; bi-monthlies, five; quarterlies, twenty-six; semi-annuals, one; annuals, two; biennials, one.

The languages used and the number published in each language, are: English, 206; German, eighteen; Bohemian, fifteen; Polish, fifteen; Italian, nine; French, nine; Ukrainian, four; Lithuanian, three; Slovenian (Jugoslav), three; Spanish, two; Ruthenian, two; Magyar, one; Slovak, one; Japanese, one; New York Point (for the Blind), one; Revised Braille (for the Blind), one.

There are a number of new features in this issue of "The Catholic Press Directory," and among the noteworthy articles is one on "The National Catholic Welfare Conference News Service," by the Right Rev. Philip R. McDevitt, D.D., Bishop of Harrisburg, and chairman of the Department of Publicity, Press and Literature of the N. C. W. C.

Another striking article in this edition is "Why Advertisers Should Use the Catholic Press," by the Rev. Charles J. Mullaly, S. J., Chairman of the Advertising Bureau of the Catholic Press Association and editor of "The Messenger of the Sacred Heart." Father Mullaly makes out a strong case for Catholic publications.

The Press Directory is endorsed by the Catholic Press Association and contains the names and addresses, a comprehensive statement explaining the nature of the periodicals published, giving, as far as obtainable, the advertising rate, the subscription price, the circulation, the size of the page and other mechanical data.

Incidentally the Directory compiler points out that since 1905 ninety-six Catholic papers and periodicals have gone out of existence or merged with other publications. Of these fifty-three were published in English, twenty-two in German and twenty-one in various other languages.

Governor Smith has set an example worthy of the imitation of every citizen, voter, politician and statesman in America. He has done this by his fearless

spirit when discussing the issues before the people, by his gallant stand for the religious liberty of his co-religionists and of all other Americans of whatever church and of none.

By doing these things openly, bravely and consistently he has proved himself deserving of the highest esteem as a man, a free-born American. We are certain, therefore, that while he has missed the office of President, he has won victories that are as precious in the eyes of every admirer and lover of courage, honesty and unquestionable fidelity to America's fundamental principles of Democracy.

Political defeat for such a man is a passing incident in a life of devotion to what he has faith in. We congratulate Governor Smith on his stalwart manhood and Americanism.

President-elect Hoover has been in the south. That sounds like a vacation trip. Any one who has been glad-handed on his way around the hospitable South American continent will appreciate that the President-elect's good-will tour was not simply a deep-sea fishing expedition.

Our Latin brothers love ceremony. This was their first chance to show an American President-elect that they are not barefoot bushwhackers, as certain uninformed countrymen of ours suppose. They took care to let him know that silk hats, five star oratory, ancient culture and modern learning play an important part in Latin American life.

While North American Indians were scalp hunting, South American Indians were completing architectural monuments that rival those of ancient Egypt. At Lima, Peru, Mr. Hoover visited a university almost twice as old as our oldest. At Santiago, Chile, he was entertained at an American Embassy that rivals Mr. Herrick's home in Paris. In Buenos Aires he drove through finer avenues than any New York can boast. In Montevideo the Avenida Wilson (named after an American President whom Latin Americans trusted and revered) showed him the advantage of subordinating business to esthetics in the development of a municipal waterfront.

And so it was throughout his journey. There are 100,000,000 Latin Americans occupying twenty Latin American republics, who are carrying forward a proud cultural and historic tradition. It is worth much to the future friendship of the Three Americas that such an open-eyed, unprejudiced, keen-witted observer as President-elect Hoover made this journey.

For, generally speaking, we know too much of Latin America's faults and not enough of her virtues. Revolutions and dictators, coffee and rubber, tangoes and tortillas are not the only products native to those regions. If more of us knew Spanish, or if Americans toured Latin America, as they tour Europe, we would understand better why the five billion dollars we have sent to Latin America represent our most productive foreign investments.

As Secretary of Commerce, Herbert Hoover learned much about profitable business relations with our southern neighbors. Now he has gained valuable additional information about their culture, their political problems, their feeling about the United States, their eagerness to work with us (not under us) in the development of the New World.

In a recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States the Ku-Klux Klan was severely censored as an organization which breeds hatreds and stimulates prejudices against Catholics, Jews, and Negroes.

Most Rev. Edward D. Howard, Archbishop of Oregon City, and Rt. Rev. Msgr. James H. Ryan, new rector of the Catholic University of America, were elected to the board of trustees of the university at the board's annual meeting held November 14.

All of the officers of the corporation were re-elected. They are: Most Rev. Michael J. Curley, Archbishop of Baltimore, president; Most Rev. John J. Glennon, Archbishop of St. Louis, vice president; Rt. Rev. Joseph Schrembs, Bishop of Cleveland, secretary, and John Joseph Nelligan, of Baltimore, treasurer.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edward A. Pace was appointed vice-rector of the Catholic University, Rt. Rev. Msgr. George A. Dougherty, procurator, and Prof. Aubrey Edward Landry, Ph.D., general secretary.

Rt. Rev. William Turner, Bishop of Buffalo, and Msgr. Ryan were named to the executive committee, Msgr. Ryan succeeding Rt. Rev. Bishop Thomas J. Shahan, rector emeritus of the university. The other members of the executive committee are Archbishop Curley, who is chancellor of the university; John J. Sullivan, of Philadelphia, and Clarence E. Martin, of Martinsburg, West Virginia.

The executive committee was directed by the board of trustees to confer with Very Rev. Dr. Henry Hyvernat Andrews professor of Biblical archaeology and professor of Semitic languages and literatures, with reference to his proposal to establish an institute for research in Oriental Christian literature. The committee also was instructed to confer with Mrs. Justine Ward, of New York, with reference to the founding of a school of music at the university.

Rev. Theodore C. Peterson, C.S.P., chaplain of Newman Hall, University of California, Berkeley, Cal., was appointed an instructor in Semitic languages and literatures at the Catholic University. He is to have charge of the cataloguing of the Coptic manuscripts of the J. Pierpont Morgan collection, which work will be done here under the auspices of the Catholic University.

Cardinal O'Connell, Archbishop of Boston, chairman of the board of trustees, presided at the meeting. Cardinal Dougherty, Archbishop of Philadelphia, and Cardinal Hayes, Archbishop of New York, attended.

Others present at the meeting included Archbishop Curley, Archbishop Glennon, Most Rev. James John Keane Archbishop of Dubuque; Most Rev. Edward J. Hanna, Archbishop of San Francisco; Most Rev. John T. McNicholas, O.P., Archbishop of Cincinnati; Most Rev. John W. Shaw, Archbishop of New Orleans; Most Rev. Austin Dowling, Archbishop of St. Paul; Bishop Schrembs, Rt. Rev. Thomas F. Lillis, Bishop of Kansas City; Rt. Rev. Thomas E. Molloy, Bishop of Brooklyn; Bishop Turner, Rt. Rev. Hugh C. Boyle, Bishop of Pittsburgh; Bishop Shahan, Msgr. Ryan, John G. Agar, of New York, and Mr. Martin.

More than ten thousand persons attended the laying of the cornerstone of the new St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, on Sunday, November 18. The chief address on the occasion was delivered by Most Rev. M. J. Curley during which he said:

Let our answer to those [who spend their time vilifying] be this glorious seminary.

"The story of religious liberty in Maryland," he said, "is one of the darkest pages in the story of our country. History shows that when preachers of religious liberty, of which we have heard so much in the last five months, became the beneficiaries of the system which existed in this state, they obtained control and began practising their diabolical bigotry."

Answering also those who say that the Catholic Church seeks to gain control of the country, Archbishop Curley said:

"One of the priests of St. Mary's Seminary will celebrate his golden anniversary Mass Wednesday. I would like to tell you laboring men what his salary is. It has been raised recently, too. He gets exactly $100 a year. So you see there is no danger of these Fathers getting control of the country through their wealth."

The Bishops attending the ceremony were the Right Rev. John M. McNamara, Auxiliary Bishop of Baltimore; Bishop Andrew J. Brenan, of Richmond; Bishop Edmund J. FitzMaurice, of Wilmington, and Bishop Thomas J. Toolen, of Mobile.

Introductory remarks were made by the Very Rev. Dr. John F. Fenlon, president of the seminary and the sermon was preached by Father James F. Nolan, pastor of Corpus Christi Church, Baltimore.

Dr. John J. Fenlon, president of St. Mary's, said, in part:

"By blessing this stone and setting it as the cornerstone of the building, we confess that Jesus Christ is the cornerstone of our religion, the foundation of our hopes in time and eternity," and then—"this seminary will be built on faith in Jesus Christ. It will be founded on the truth as it is Jesus Christ—and on the love of Jesus Christ."

Upon what more stable foundation can any building be erected? The truth and love of Jesus Christ are Eternal. The cornerstone of the new St. Mary's is the cornerstone of an institution which will perpetuate the Eternal Priesthood.

Christ, Father Fenlon said, is the builder of the new seminary. In it Christ will be the Teacher. The great lessons which will be learned there will be learned at the Tabernacle of Jesus by those who are to become in turn His tabernacles.

So it is the new Saint Mary's will be the old Saint Mary's in new apparel, as Father Fenlon said. It will be more than that, it will be the continuation of the First Seminary taught by Jesus Christ.

As Father Fenlon spoke the ten thousand began to awaken to the meaning of the ceremonies. They were in the presence of the inescapable fact that the Catholic Church is Eternal because the Founder of that Church is Eternal.

During the course of his introductory remarks Dr. Fenlon paid an eloquent and precious tribute to Archbishop Curley whose zeal and enthusiasm for the Sulpician project are too well known to need further amplification.

The glorious days of autumn witnessed an important event in the life of Saint Gertrude's School of Arts and Crafts, located in Brookland, D. C.

This event was its transfer from the original home of the school on Bunker Hill road—the farmhouse that served for living quarters during the two years since the school was established, the barn that furnished space for the classroom and students' workshops, and the garage that answered the purposes of a dining room—to the nearby modern school building on Sargent road now approaching completion.

The new edifice is a four-story concrete structure of semi-Tudor style. On the first floor are the kitchen, dining room, Sisters' refectory, and the domestic science room, which last includes a model dining room.

On the second floor the classrooms, students' workshop, reception room and office.

The third floor, the dressing rooms, lavatories, infirmary and sleeping porches.

The fourth floor, which will probably ultimately be the chapel, is left unfinished.

Close to the school building and connected with it by a covered porch is the farmhouse which is to serve as a convent for the sisters in charge.

Saint Gertrude's School of Arts and Crafts is intended not for children requiring custodial care nor yet for those to whom Nature has been most kind, but for children between these two extremes—the backward children who cannot keep pace with their contemporaries in the ordinary schools.

The school is conducted by Sisters of the Benedictine Order, under the supervision of the Rev. Dr. Thomas Verner Moore, Professor of Psychology at the Catholic University of America, director of the Clinic for Mental and Nervous Diseases at Providence Hospital, Washington, and internationally known as a psychiatrist.

The American Irish Historical Society held a memorial meeting at its headquarters, New York, on Sunday evening, December 9, to commemorate the signal services to the Irish race in America of Dr. Edward F. McSweeney, its first vice-president-general. Dr. McSweeney was a native of Marlboro, Mass. His death was due to a motor accident which occurred near his home, Framingham, Mass., on November 18. The deceased was a very active worker in the historical field and was author of many valuable treatises and essays on various aspects of Immigration, Public Health, and Transportation. For many years he was editor-in-chief of the *Boston Traveller*.

Hundreds of persons gathered at the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception on the campus of the Catholic University of America, Saturday afternoon, December 8—the Feast of the Immaculate Conception—for the formal presentation to the Shrine of the Mary Memorial Altar, a gift sponsored by the International Federation of Catholic Alumnae.

Following these exercises, a tablet was unveiled at the Catholic Sister's College to commemorate the establishment at the college of the Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edward A. Pace Scholarship, founded by the International Federation of Catholic Alumnae in recognition of Monsignor Pace's services as moderator of the Federation.

Simple ceremonies marked the presentation of the memorial altar. A dedicatory tablet, placed in the wall of an uncompleted portion of the crypt, was unveiled and a sum presented sufficient to complete the Federation's pledge of $20,000.

The Rev. Dr. Bernard A. McKenna, director of the work on the Shrine, presided at the exercises and introduced Mrs. Mary B. Finan, national president of the Alumnae Federation.

"We are gathered here today," Mrs. Finan said, "in performance of a duty which, right gladly, we took upon ourselves. Our offer of an altar in honor of the Blessed Mother was spontaneous and sincere—springing from the love of her which is the sweetest fruit of our school-day experience.

"Our Federation, it is true, has many aims and undertakings which appeal to each and all of our members. None is dearer to us than that which now is brought to realization. None surely is a clearer expression of the spirit which animates and guides us in all our endeavors.

"Since Mary Immaculate is the heavenly patroness of the Church in our country, we, as a nation-wide association of Catholic women, owe her a particular tribute of devotion.

"Since the Catholic University of America, through its Constitution as approved by the Holy See, has been placed under her protection, it is fitting that the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception should rise upon these grounds in grandeur and beauty befitting her dignity.

"We therefore deem it a privilege and a distinction that we are to have some part in the adornment of this great temple, and that our Federation is to be associated with so many zealous and generous donors whose love of Mary has made this undertaking possible and assured its success."

Mrs. Finan then made presentation of the money to the Rt. Rev. Bishop Thomas J. Shahan, rector emeritus of the University and honorary president of the Federation, who spoke briefly, expressing his gratitude and remarking upon the sacrifice which the gift represented. The tablet was unveiled by Sister Mary de Paul Cogan, one of the co-founders of the Federation, and Mrs. Mary Wade Kalbach. Short addresses by Monsignor Pace and Mrs. Clara Sheeran of Brooklyn, also a co-founder of the Federation followed this ceremony.

The Very Rev. Dr. P. J. McCormick, dean of the Sisters' College, presided over the exercises honoring the establishment of the Monsignor Pace Scholarship. The commemorative tablet was unveiled by Sister Mary de Paul Cogan and Mrs. Sheeran.

The Rt. Rev. Msgr. James H. Ryan, Rector of the Catholic University, and Monsignor Pace were presented by Dr. McCormick and spoke briefly. Mrs. Finan, responding on behalf of the Federation, presented a check for $10,000 with which the scholarship is to be established. Mrs. Harry M. Benzinger presented Dr. Pace with a bound volume containing the names of all the contributors to the scholarship fund. The scholarship is to be used by a member of one of the religious Sisterhoods who, holding a collegiate degree, wishes to pursue higher studies at the Catholic University.

PROGRAMME

NINTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION
Indianapolis, December 28-31, 1928

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 28, 1928

9:00 A. M. MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.

10:00 A. M. PUBLIC SESSION. *Chairman*, Rt. Rev. Francis H. Gavisk, D.D., V.G.

The Paschal Question during the Pontificate of Pope St. Victor I. Very Rev. Charles L. Souvay, C.M., Ph.D., D.D., S.S.D., Kenrick Seminary, Webster Groves, Missouri.

Cardinal Pole and the Problem of Christian Unity. Rev. Gerald G. Walsh, S.J., M.A. (Oxon.), Rome, Italy. Read by Rev. Lawrence R. Patterson, S.J., Woodstock, Maryland.

The Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide. Rev. R. Corrigan, S.J., Ph.D., University of Detroit, Detroit, Michigan.

12:30 P. M. LUNCHEON CONFERENCE: *Catholic Historical Activities in the United States.* Chairman, Dr. Guilday.

4:00 P. M.-5:00 P. M. ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING. *Chairman*, Dr. John C. Fitzpatrick, President of the Association.

1. *Annual Report of the Secretary.*
2. *Report of the Treasurer.*
3. *Report of the Committee on Membership.*
4. *Election of new Members.*
5. *Election of Officers for the year 1929.*

9:45 P. M. SMOKER FOR MEMBERS OF ALL THE ASSOCIATIONS.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 29, 1928

10:00 A. M. PUBLIC SESSION. *Chairman*, Hon. James E. Deery.

Irish Monasteries on the Continent during the Middle Ages. Rev. Joseph Fuhrmann, O.S.B., Ph.D., Corpus Christi College, Corpus Christi, Texas.

The Renaissance and Individualism. Rev. Philip J. Furlong, Ph.D., Cathedral College, New York City.

Bossuet and the Gallican Movement. Very Rev. Alfred Barry, O.S.F.C., Providence, Rhode Island.

The Vatican School of Paleography. Rev. Boniface Stratemeier, O.P., Ph.D., S.T.Lr., Catholic University of America.

12:30 P. M. LUNCHEON CONFERENCE. *The Problem of Teaching American Church History in Secondary Schools.* Sister Mary Celeste, A.M., St. Xavier's College, Chicago, Ill.

3:00-4:00 P. M GENERAL SESSION of the Association. *Chairman*, Dr. Leo F. Stock, First Vice-President of the Association.

Presidential Address, *George Washington and Religion*, Dr. John C. Fitzpatrick.

4:00-5:30 P. M. TEA FOR MEMBERS OF ALL THE ASSOCIATIONS.

6:00 P. M. The members of the American Catholic Historical Association were invited to attend the subscription Dinner of the American Historical Association.

8:15 P. M. The members of the Association were invited to attend the General Session of the American Historical Association.

SUNDAY, DECEMBER 30, 1928

8:00 P. M. RECEPTION FOR MEMBERS OF ALL THE ASSOCIATIONS AND MUSICALE BY THE GORDON STRING QUARTET, OF CHICAGO. John Herron Art Institute, Sixteenth and Pennsylvania Streets.

8:30 P. M. A PUBLIC MEETING under the Auspices of the Knights of Columbus was held in the Auditorium, 13th and Delaware Streets. *Chairman*, Rt. Rev. Francis H. Gavisk, D.D., V.G.

Address: *The Catholic Chapter in American History*, Rev. Dr. Peter Guilday, Secretary of the Association.

MONDAY, DECEMBER 31, 1928

10:00 A. M. PUBLIC SESSION. *Chairman*, Rev. Joseph E. Hamill, Ph.D.

The Sources of the American Declaration of Independence. Rev. John C. Rager, S.T.D., Shelbyville, Indiana.

St. Francis de Sales: Christian Humanist. Rev. Peter Leo Johnson, D.D., St. Francis Seminary, St. Francis, Wisconsin.

The Historical Development of the First Order of St. Francis. Rev. Francis Borgia Steck, O.F.M., Ph.D., Quincy College, Quincy, Illinois.

Recognition of Soviet Russia must come only after Russia has adhered to the principles of international law and respects the rights of other nations, the Rev. Dr. Edmund A. Walsh, S.J., Vice-President of Georgetown University, declared in a public lecture at the Catholic University of America here on December 10. The lecture was the first of a series to be given under the auspices of the Catholic University.

Dr. Walsh prefaced this declaration by a study of Russia's attitude towards international law, pointing out that it had sent into this country a large sum of money to be expended in the promotion of unrest, and that its emissaries to other nations have been reminded constantly by officials that it is their duty always to promote "the world revolution." It is an international impertinence, he said, for any government to subsidize such practices and then to knock at the door of the State Department and ask for admission to equality with the nations of the world.

The speaker expressed the hope, however, that conditions would soon be such that the United States could extend the hand of friendship and co-operation as it did some years ago.

The Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edward A. Pace, Vice-Rector of the Catholic University, introduced Dr. Walsh to an audience which overflowed the auditorium of McMahon Hall.

Dr. Walsh began by reviewing for his audience the fall of the Russian Empire eleven years ago and the killing of the Czar and his family and suite. He turned briefly then to the Kerensky regime, and then to the rise to power of Lenin, and the efforts of the Soviet to create a new prototype of humanity—"the collective man." He wove into his story many interesting incidents which came under his personal observation in Russia, among them the trial of Archbishop Cieplak, Monsignor Budkiewicz and a number of priests, which, with its results, attracted world wide interest and indignation. So far as he knew, he said, Russia is the only nation on the face of the earth where it is a penal offense to believe in Almighty God.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Crusades and Other Historical Essays, presented to Dana C. Munro by his former students. Edited by Louis J. Paetow. New York F. S. Crofts and Company, 1928. Pp. x + 419.

Here we have a volume of twelve authoritative essays written by the former students of a great teacher of history, Professor Dana C. Munro of Princeton University, and presented to him on the occasion of his occupying the presidency of the American Historical Association. Professor Louis J. Paetow is the editor of the present volume, and one of the essays is from his pen, "The Crusading Ardor of John of Garland." This essay is a study primarily of John of Garland's poem *De triumphis ecclesiae,* a work which "offers valuable sidelights on important events in history, such as the Third Crusade, the Albigensian wars, the founding of the University of Toulouse, the wars between Louis IX and Henry III over Poitou, the coming of the Tartars into Europe, the strife between popes and Hohenstaufen emperors, and the first crusade of King Louis IX." (pp. 209-210). He presents the work of this mediaeval professor at Paris as very significant in any attempt to arrive at the history of thought and attitude, as well as in modifying certain current notions about the supposed "golden age" of St. Louis.

The first essay is by Professor Einar Joranson. It deals with an important event that came shortly before the crusading epoch, "The Great German Pilgrimage of 1064-1065." We are indebted to Professor Joranson for showing us the difficulty experienced by the Fatimite Caliphate in maintaining order in Palestine and in protecting Christian pilgrims even though there was a genuine desire to do so. He causes us to revise the long accepted opinion that it was the coming of the Seljuk Turks which made the crusades necessary, and suggests that West-Europeans would probably have been obliged to use military force in any event if pilgrimages were to be rendered safe.

Professor Frederic Duncalf in his essay, "The Pope's Plan for the First Crusade," develops the interesting theory that Urban II did more than set the crusade afoot and announce its primary objectives. According to this scholar the Roman pontiff had a definite plan of action that was to be followed out each

step along the way, and as occasions and crises presented themselves. Professor Duncalf appears to believe that this plan included the permanent establishment of Latin states in the East. He further indicates that it was Raymond of Toulouse, who, of all the leaders of this crusade, tried most earnestly to follow the papal plan, and by his frequent obstinacy in council induced the others to do so, often against their will. While this essay is the shortest in the collection, it brings forward one of the most novel viewpoints and back it up with considerable evidence.

Space will not permit an adequate summary of all the essays included within this volume. There are some of such timely interest, however, that they cannot be passed over too hurriedly. One such is Professor M. M. Knappen's "Robert II of Flanders in the First Crusade." This is a contribution of importance in that it presents this prince as occupying a more prominent place than is usually accorded him. Professor Knappen gives abundant evidence to show that Count Robert was one of the genuine idealists of the whole movement, a conciliatory spirit and mediator in the midst of the violent quarrels which frequently agitated the other leaders and threatened the enterprise with ruin, a man whose "sword was ever drawn in an honorable and altruistic cause." (p. 100). Of equal import is the essay of Professor A. A. Beaumont, Jr., "Albert of Aachen and the County of Edessa," which is the most recent vindication of that writer in the long controversy anent his authenticity. Professor Eugene H. Byrne's "The Genoese Colonies in Syria" is of great interest for its study of this pioneer enterprise in the general movement of European expansion and commercial imperialism which has for centuries been the most significant fact in political history. Other essays having to do with the crusades are Professor August C. Krey's "A Neglected Passage in the *Gesta* and Its Bearing on the Literature of the First Crusade" and Professor Milton R. Gutsch's "A Twelfth Century Preacher—Fulk of Neuilly."

The *Other Historical Essays* are four in number: Professor James F. Willard's "An Exchequer Reform Under Edward I," Professor Bernadotte E. Schmitt's "Lord Haldane's Mission to Berlin in 1912," Professor William E. Lingelbach's "Sources of Diplomatic History and the Control of Foreign Affairs," and Mr. Herbert A. Kellar's "Rockbridge County, Virginia, in 1835: A

Study of Ante-bellum Society." Professor Williams contributes some new material that will interest the student of English economic and constitutional history. Professor Schmitt shows an exhaustive knowledge of all the available sources and personal versions of that attempted reapprochement which ended disastrously because, in the words of Bethmann with which he appropriately closes his essay, "the problem before us suffers from the defect that because of its inherent difficulties, it admits of no solution." (p. 288). Professor Lingelbach gives a wealth of valuable advice to the student (particularly to the young student) of international relations in modern history; he includes what virtually amounts to a catalogue of source materials and a guide to their use. In some respects Mr. Kellar's essay is the most fruitful of those in this section of the volume. It is a genuine contribution to the *Kulturgeschichte* of America. After a brief geographical introduction he gives us an admirable cross section of the district which he is studying at a given period: its religious and educational life; its law and jurisprudence; its political and military aspects; its social, intellectual, and economic activities.

Following the essays there is an imposing list of the publications of Professor Munro, compiled and arranged chronologically by Marion Peabody West. There is also appended a list of the patrons of the enterprise, which includes the names of many prominent American historians. The index is the work of Mr. Kellar.

HEWITT B. VINNEDGE.

The Taking of Ticonderoga in 1775: the British Story. By Allen French. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass. 1928. Pp. 90.

Mr. French reopens the story of Ticonderoga after studying the British official report sent by Lieutenant Jocelyn Feltham of the detachment of the 26th regiment of foot to General Gage in Boston which has been made accessible recently through the courtesy of Lord Gage, the present owner of the General Gage papers. He realizes that it is unwise to disagree with the legendary story of the capture for certain Americans will object to a corrected account which minimizes the valor and forceful language of the rough frontiersman, Ethan Allen, and gives just credit to Benedict Arnold as a joint-conqueror of the surprised

and wretchedly defenceless fort. He is aware that during the past twenty years the virulence of patriotism has grown: "Various defenders of Washington's fame have objected to new presentations of the facts of the life of the father of his country. The mayor of a great American city finds political profit in assailing any change from history as taught in the days of our ancestor worship. And at least one more writer [John Spargo, *Ethan Allen at Ticonderoga*, 1926] has gone on record as lessening Arnold's claim to equal command at the Ticonderoga assault. To vary from any story of the ancient grammar-school histories has become a social crime." (P. 20)

Reviewing the American contemporary accounts including Allen's two books of 1779 when his earlier story was somewhat improved in the light of Jocelyn Feltham's report to his superior, Mr. French modestly states his conclusions: the hesitancy of the various continental and provincial governments to accept responsibility for the capture; the sad state of the fort's repair; the weakened character of the garrison; the joint demand of Allen and Arnold on behalf of the Connecticut and Massachusetts extra-legal governments for its surrender; the deshabille of Feltham, not of the commander, Captain Delaplace, who at Arnold's order was given time to dress; the unlikelihood of Allen's dramatic demand for surrender in the name of the Great Jehovah and the Continental Congress; the fair treatment of the officers and their families, but the harsh treatment of the common soldiers who were probably absorbed in the Connecticut population; and the pillage of the fort. Allen, and good patriots have followed his account, carefully excluded Arnold. How could the later traitor have claims to glory? The author concludes: "For it would seem to be proved that Ticonderoga was surrendered not merely to two bold adventurers, nor upon a bombastic demand, but to the authority of Massachusetts and Connecticut, exercised jointly." And extreme doubt is thus cast on another dramatic incident of American traditional history!

RICHARD J. PURCELL, PH.D.

Massachusetts Historical Society, Proceedings, October, 1926-June, 1927. Boston, 1927.

As usual this annual volume of proceedings is filled with a number of obituary memoirs and literary appreciations of re-

cently deceased members of the society by the worshipful present generation: sketches of James Ford Rhodes; Chief Justice John Aiken; Brooks Adams whose rebel writings annoyed conventional capitalists and destroyed the filiopietistic writing of New England history and biography; President Eliot of Harvard; William Wallace Crapo, politician, lawyer, and New Bedford businessman; and Paul Revere Frothingham, a writer of Massachusetts history. There are also a number of valuable letters: one of William Cowper's, three of Walter Scott's, one of James Fenimore Cooper's, one of Browning's, one of Tennyson's, one of Carlyle's, three of Emerson's, two letters of Harrison Gray Otis on the Hartford Convention, some of Sumner's epistles to Governor Andrew, and a few Hancock letters sent from Philadelphia in 1776. Admiral Bowles contributes a valuable paper on "America's debt to De Grasse"; Charles Warren offers an uninteresting sketch of "Samuel Adams and the Sans Souci Club in 1785"; Winslow Warren writes an appreciation of Massachusetts Oratory; Colonel Banks adds an account of "English Sources of Emigration to New England"; and A. B. Hart discusses very sanely such recent lives of Washington as those by Charles Moore, W. E. Woodward, and Rupert Hughes, although he quite naturally disagrees with the destructive tone of the last two especially when they deal with Washington's personal life in the fashion of historical psychiatrists.

A letter of Thomas Aspinwall dated London, 24 March, 1848 to Daniel Webster reviews briefly the likelihood of a Polish rising against Russian despotism, the financial crisis in France, and the trouble in Ireland concerning which he writes: "The newspapers make great complaints that English workmen have been driven out of France, but the Irish say that is the way the English treat the Irish in England. Young Ireland has been endeavoring to get up monster meetings and has also been talking sedition. In consequence of this Smith O'Brien, a conspicuous M.P., Mr. Mitchell, the editor of the *Nation*, and a Mr. Meagher have been arrested and held to bail. But hitherto all is quiet in Ireland."

The brief Diary of William Cheevers for a number of days from May 19, 1775 to March 17, 1776 (pp. 91-97) is curiously dull and impersonal even when noting the battle of Bunker Hill and the Evacuation of Boston which thrilled his more

patriotic Harvard classmates. For June 17, he wrote: "A large number (2 or 3, thousand) of Regulars commanded by General Howe were boated over to Charlestown today to dislodge the Provincials of a Hill which they had intrenched on; this they did, and set the town of Charlestown on fire. The engagement was very warm whereby a great many are killed and wounded (1,000 or 1,100 of the Regulars), a melancholy Scene of Fire and Slaughter." Regarding the departure of General Howe, the youthful Cheevers who might have shouldered a gun is even less enthusiastic: "March 8th. A flag was sent out to inform General Washington that General Howe would remove his troops without injuring the Town, unless He (General Washington) fired upon his Rear. 9th. An answer by one of Washington ('s) Officer's—that as Gen. Howe did not see fit to offer any terms that should be obligatory upon him; so Gen. Washington would not engage himself by any neither. 17th. Gen. Howe left the Town this morning with his Troops; upon which the Continental ary enter'd it."

RICHARD J. PURCELL, PH.D.

The Story of Sir Charles Vereker. By Jessie A. Gaughan. New York.: P. J. Kenedy & Sons, 1927. Pp. 298.

This is a historical romance, the scenes of which are laid in England and Ireland during the reign of Charles the First. Naturally he figures largely in these pages, with his efficient emissary, Cromwell. Prince Rupert and Sir Henry Ireton also play important parts; so that the volume may be regarded as affording matter for interesting supplementary reading in any history class. The characters are well developed; historical incidents accurately stated; and the style is sufficiently good to hold the interest of the average reader until the end of the book.

J. F. L.

Literary Art and Education. By Reverend P. Donnelly, S.J. New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons, 1927. Pp. xxiv + 328.

This volume should be prized by every one interested in the art and science of education. That education is a science no one today will dispute. That it may be also an art Father Donnelly proves conclusively. But his art is guided by the sound scientific

principles of long-tried pedagogical methods. His ideas are classical, his views are conservative. The three chapters devoted to the educational value of history will particularly interest our readers. The author discusses the disciplinary and cultural import of the scientific study of history. Although the matter in these pages is heavy, the gifted author's kindly humor and scintillating style make it easy reading. J. F. L.

Issac Jogues, Missioner and Martyr. By Martin J. Scott, S.J. New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons, 1927. Pp. xii + 242.

On the title page, Father Scott modestly states that this volume is an adaptation of the original biography of the famous apostle to the Iroquois by Martin-Shea. Even so, we are indebted to Father Scott for this latest life of his Blessed Jesuit brother, whose blood consecrated the soil of the Mohawk valley. Every healthy boy and girl will be thrilled by reading this account of daring adventure, narrow escapes and heroic courage displayed by a buccaneer of Christ. Issac Jogues was a free lance who used his love of adventure to slake his thirst for souls. While his principal aim was the Christianizing of the red men, he incidentally brought no small measure of European civilization to our western shores. A man of many parts, with refinement, culture, and literary talent, he gave his all for the moral uplift of the savages, and in the giving he found his life. His letters afford valuable contributions to ethnology. The personal sanctity of the man is so evident in these pages that one is not surprised to learn that recent miracles attributed to his intercession lead us to expect his canonization in the near future.

J. F. L.

Letters of a Bishop to His Flock. By His Eminence George Cardinal Mundelein. New York, Chicago, and Cincinnati: Benziger Brothers. Pp. 317.

These letters, the Cardinal tells us, form part of the history of his archdiocese. Hence they have a strong claim to being mentioned in these columns. Their dates run between 1918 and 1927. We are not surprised therefore to find the subjects touched ranging in interest from Benedict the fifteenth and Peter's Pence to the Eucharistic Congress film. During this

recent constructive period, the Church has striven successfully to meet the exigencies of the times. These epistles voice the sentiments of the great Cardinal on the topics of the hour, and reveal him no less a man of affairs than a pious bishop holding aloft to his flock the beacon light of Faith. In his war-time letters we can see the philosopher, while his messages during the Eucharistic Congress prove him a historian and a theologian. The book well deserves a place in the library of every Catholic seminary, college, school, and convent throughout the country, where it will afford instructive and pleasant reading for young and old alike. J. F. L.

Builders of America. By Thomas Bonaventure Lawler. Boston: Ginn & Co. Pp. 391.

The learned author has long since won a high rank among historians by his text books which for years have been used with satisfaction in many of our schools. In this, his last volume, Dr. Lawler gives us a book which will enrich and supplement his texts, and furnish the young student with a background for the bare historical facts of the ordinary history. The "Study Suggestions" at the end of each chapter will please many an earnest, over-burdened teacher. The print, paper, and illustrations are all that could be desired in such a book, while its modest price places it within the reach of all. J. F. L.

The Journeys of Jesus. By Sister James Stanislaus of the Sisters of St. Joseph of Carondelet. 15 Ashburton Place, Boston: Published by Ginn & Company.

The three volumes comprising this series seem to be a response to the Divine injunction: "Suffer the little one to come unto Me!" The old, old story, ever new, of Jesus of Nazareth finds in these pages a novel presentation. Even our children of larger growth can here cull instruction and help. The matter is copiously and attractively illustrated with pictures well executed and quite uncommon. Many a religion hour in any grade can easily be enriched by an intelligent use of these books. The publishers have given us good print, stout, tough paper, and serviceable binding for a nominal price. The value

of each volume is enhanced by a splendid map of Palestine, and leading questions at the end of every chapter. S. J. F.

St. Francis Xavier, the Apostle of India and Japan. Adapted from the German of Reverend G. Schurhammer, S.J. By Frank J. Eble, M.A. St. Louis, Mo.: Published by B. Herder Book Company, 1928. Pp. vii + 321.

This volume will be of real value to every earnest student of history, ethnology, and the social sciences. The author has gone to first sources for his material. St. Francis Xavier was a buccaneer of Christ. The times in which he lived, the men with whom he labored, the obstacles with which he had to cope, are here most accurately outlined. The deeds he dared and did, and which have made his name famous throughout the centuries, are graphically depicted, so that even a casual reader will be held involuntarily to the pages. The text reads well, and has not suffered by either translation or adaptation from the larger and more weighty tome in German. We welcome this book to our daily increasing list of saints' lives, which are historical as well as devotional. S. J. F.

Religions Past and Present. By Bertram C. A. Windle, F.R.S. New York and London: The Century Company, 8 vo. Pp. x + 308.

The twenty-three chapters of which this book is composed, formed the basis of a course of lectures delivered by the learned author in the University of Toronto. They will be of particular interest to the intellectually élite. Not their least recommendation lies in the fact that Sir Bertram acknowledges in his preface that he has approached the subject from the standpoint of Christianity. So that followers of Christ may read the book with confidence and find it a help in the study of comparative religion. It is confessedly written for the ordinary reader, but it will be of profit to even the more discriminating, who are used to handling heavier volumes. The bibliographical list at the end of the volume furnishes suggestions for those who care to delve deeper into the subject. S. J. F.

NOTICES

In the archives of Leningrad a secret drawer has been accidentally discovered. It contained one hundred Papal Bulls dating from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. They are said to possess high artistic and historic value. They have numerous Papal seals and signatures, and are written in Latin with Gothic characters. The collection will be given to one of the museums.

According to data recently printed in the *Deutsche Presse*, there are at present appearing there no fewer than nine dailies that began to be published in the seventeenth century in Germany. The oldest of these is the *Magdeburgische Zeitung*, which was founded in 1626. Then comes the *Kölnische Zeitung*, launched in 1651, followed by the *Leipziger Zeitung* in 1660 and by the others at greater intervals.

The mortality among German dailies has been heavy since the World War, the number being published at the beginning of last year, being 3,257, against 4,221 in 1914. The population of Germany, due to loss of territory and war casualties, fell from 67,800,000 to 62,500,000 during the same period.

From far-off Tokyo we have received "with the compliments of Dai Nippon Yubenkwai Kodausha" an interesting brochure, *Seiji Noma, "Magazine King" of Japan*. The contents of the little volume were originally published in *The Japan Advertiser*, Tokyo, in a series of articles written by Mr. Shunkichi Akimoto. It is "a portrait drawn by a friendly but independent observer," and makes very interesting reading for a Westerner.

The Historical Bulletin formerly edited by Rev. Francis S. Betten, S.J., formerly of John Carroll University, Cleveland, is now under the editorship of Fr. Gilbert J. Garrigan, S.J., of St. Louis University. Fr. Garrigan is a most competent historical author; but he is not so well known personally to the writer as is Fr. Betten. Fr. Betten is now located at Marquette University; we hope that in his new sphere of labor, he will not be too busy to keep in close touch with THE CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW. He is an old and valued friend and his interest in our historical work has been most helpful.

The Church and the Citizen, by Dr. John A. Ryan, is an outstanding volume of "The Calvert Series," published by Macmillan, New York. It is a lucid exposition of some very practical issues and the chapter on "Nationalism" is one that should prove particularly valuable, for Nationalism actually is patriotism run wild and at the present time it seems to have become the besetting sin of several great nations, America included.

Fr. Moorhouse F. X. Millar in *Unpopular Essays in the Philosophy of History* (Fordham University Press), has produced another most valuable volume and its contents according to Dr. John A. Ryan, who contributes a preface, "constitute

an historical and critical discussion of the most fundamental doctrines and principles that have affected or still affect human society and life."

Prepared under the supervision of a Committee of Bishops, appointed by the Hierarchy at their last meeting in Washington in September, 1927, the first issue of the *Official Catholic Year Book* has just been published. This committee composed of the Rt. Rev. Thomas J. Walsh, D. D., Bishop of Newark; the Rt. Rev. Francis C. Kelley, D. D., Bishop of Oklahoma, and the Rt. Rev. John F. Noll, D. D., Bishop of Fort Wayne, co-operating with the publishers, P. J. Kenedy & Sons, and the National Catholic Welfare Conference, have produced an interesting volume containing much information hitherto unavailable without intensive and costly research.

In the comparatively brief compass of seven hundred odd pages is a mass of information of things Catholic which Catholics should know. Bishop Kelley in his preface says: "Our Year Book is not merely a collection of tables and statistics. It is evidence of the existence of a religious spirit in the American people—of the vitality of faith—of the undying quality of the teachings of the Church as well as their adaptability to many men of many minds—evidence that the religion of Jesus Christ is alien to no age, no race and no good form of government."

This evidence of the religious spirit of the Catholic Church is considered under many different articles by authoritative writers and is also shown in much statistical matter.

Mr. Ernest F. Boddington has contributed a chronology of events of interest to Catholics under twenty-six different headings, giving a day by day record from August 1, 1927, to July 31, 1928.

Rt. Rev. Monsignor James H. Ryan, the new Rector of the Catholic University, has summarized all the Encyclicals of Pope Pius XI and has translated the two important Encyclicals in full. He also contributes a resume of the pastorals of the American Hierarchy. There is a brief history of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States which sums up the Church's progress. Rev. George P. Stratemeier, O.P., has prepared a paper on the early Catholic explorers. Mr. William F. Montavon sums up the religious situation in Mexico to which article is added a chronology of events connected with the Catholic persecution in that country.

The Catholic Hierarchy, including the Cardinals, Sacred Congregations, Apostolic Delegations, Patriarchates, the Sees Residential and Vicariates Apostolic, are given in full. There is also a list of the Hierarchy in the United States and brief biographies of the newly-appointed Bishops. For the first time, a complete list of Monsignori and Deans with addresses is available. Every Seminary, House of Study and Mother-house of Religious Orders is listed with the name and address of the Superior and the course of study given by each institution.

The statistics of Religious Communities hitherto available in the Official Catholic Directory have been transferred to the Year Book. A complete list of Provincials, Superiors, etc., arranged alphabetically according to the Orders to which they belong, for both men and women, is given and the Missionary

Activities formerly collated in the Catholic Directory has been entirely rearranged and is now much more convenient as a matter of reference.

One of the most important and interesting sections of the Year Book is concerned with the work of Catholic Hospitals in the United States. Every Catholic hospital is listed with address and the name of the Religious Order in charge. The Rev. Edward F. Garesche, S.J., offers three brief articles on the Catholic Hospital Association, the Catholic Guild of Nurses and the Catholic Medical Mission Board.

Mr. Charles A. McMahon, editor of the *N. C. W. C. Bulletin*, explains the organization, departments and fields of activity of the National Catholic Welfare Conference. The importance of the Catholic Press has not been forgotten for there are two articles on this subject. One sums up the achievements of the N. C. W. C. News Service and the other by Mr. Joseph H. Meier, secretary of the Catholic Press Association, lists every Catholic paper in the United States.

For the first time information regarding the numerous Catholic Lay Organizations is presented. In the Year Book will be found data regarding practically all important Catholic fraternal organizations.

Mr. Simon A. Baldus, President of the Catholic Press Association, is represented by a brief article on the Catholic Literary Awards Foundation. A section of the Year Book lists a bibliography of important Catholic books.

Other articles, written by the outstanding Catholic writers on the subjects, appear on Catholic Education, Catholic Charities and Industrial Problems, Rural Life, and Catholic America's History, in peace and in war.

The publication of the first of the twenty volumes of the monumental work the *Dictionary of American Biography* is an event of first importance and magnitude in the field of American history and literature and gives promise of the fulfilment of a long-cherished hope. America is at last to have her history adequately written in the biographies of her citizens, for the real history of America is written in the "lives" of those who have helped to make it.

This is the first time such a history has been undertaken on a scale comparable with its importance and with a promise of successful completion. It has been begun and carried forward by the Council of the Learned Societies of America, the mere list of whose names shows how fully representative of scholarship in America this group is and gives assurance of the high quality and authoritativeness of this work of many years.

The magnitude of the undertaking is suggested by the fact that more than $500,000 is being spent merely for gathering and editing the material. The work when completed will contain more than 14,000 biographies, and it is stated that no such complete assembly of the significant names in American history, political and social, has ever before been undertaken. Many will be recovered that have "slipped into oblivion" and fresh appraisement will be made of those whose names are remembered. Only a thoroughly organized effort under highly competent direction could succeed in carrying through such a national enterprise. It is not only of national scope but of national importance, since it seeks to preserve for all time the tradition of America in the days of its making.

The Grey Nuns in Pembroke (Ont., Canada) is an illuminating brochure by Rev. Dr. John J. O'Gorman, of Ottawa. Dr. O'Gorman has contributed extensively to Catholic historical literature not only in his native province of Ontario but beyond the borders of the Dominion of Canada.

The Catholic Church and Healing, by Dr. James J. Walsh, is a scholarly and accurate work and it is amazing how much information Dr. Walsh has contrived to pack within such a small volume of 109 pages. The reader will find this little book fascinating and instructive. Dr. Walsh needs no introduction to readers of THE CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW.

Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society, Worcester, 1928. N. S. Vol. 37 (1927-28) contains valuable articles by W. H. Siebert, "East Florida as a Refuge for Southern Loyalists, 1774-1785," and G. W. Cole, "Lewis Hughes, the Militant Minister of the Bermudas and His Printed Works." The efficient librarian, Clarence S. Brigham, contributes a report on the library and its recent acquisitions. There is a list of children's books published in America prior to 1800, which I believe would offer good material for a master's essay where the writer was interested in determining whether or not Puritan intolerance of Catholicism and hostility to England was being bred into the younger generation in their readers, catechisms, and spiritual exercises which were then drawn up by ministers of undoubtedly narrow, sectarian views. Among the obituaries, the sketches worthy of attention are the following: ex-Senator Beveridge, Henry E. Huntington, railroad magnate, collector of rare books, and philanthropist, and James K. Hosmer, who wrote numerous books on history without making much of a contribution to the science.

R. J. P.

Antonianum, the learned philosophico-theological periodical, with headquarters at 124 Via Merulana, Rome, is one of the most valuable among our exchanges. It is brimful of excellent matter and it deserves wide recognition. It is specifically ecclesiastical and its Latinity is good exercise for many whose climb to Parnassus was satisfactorily accomplished.

Souvenir of the Golden Jubilee of the Dedication of St. Aloysius Church, Carthagena, Ohio, by the pastor, Rev. Ulrich F. Mueller, C. PP.S., 1928, pp. 93, is a carefully compiled brochure telling the story of St. Aloysius Church, Carthagena, from the organization of the parish, in 1865, by Father Schelbert, C. PP.S., who drew to him a congregation of hardworking German emigrants. It was well worth doing. It contains much material in the way of religious and social notes, annals, and lists of marriages, baptisms, and deaths which should be used by the future historian of the Church in Ohio and of the German Catholics in the old Northwest. Such parish registers in the future will be far more valuable as sources of local information than their present compilers are aware, and hence should be written by pastors when their parishes celebrate a fiftieth or a hundredth anniversary.

R. J. P.

Under the able editorship of Dr. Smith, professor of Dogmatic Theology at St. Edmund's College, the Macmillan Company has begun the publication of thirty-six small volumes, four by six and one-half inches, which aim to bring the whole body of Catholic teaching within the range of the ordinary reader. It is known as "The Treasury of the Faith Series." All the volumes will be approximately one hundred pages each. Since the primary object of the series is to be neither apologetic nor controversial, but expository, the chief emphasis will be laid upon the fundamental dogmas of the Faith. A competent theologian is to prepare each volume, explaining in simple language some important point of Catholic doctrine.

Six volumes of the series have now been published. These are: "An Outline of Catholic Teaching," by the Editor; "God the Creator," by Rev. B. V. Miller, Ph.D., D.D.; "Jesus Christ, Model of Mankind," by the Most Rev. Alban Goodier, S.J., Archbishop of Hierapolis; "Mary, Mother of God," by Rev. O. R. Vassar-Phillips, C. SS.R.; "The Sacramental System," by Rev. C. C. Martindale, S.J.; "Christian Marriage," by Rev. E. J. Mahoney, D.D. The remaining volumes of the series will follow at short intervals.

With the volumes thus far published as a criterion, the object proposed bids fair to find its achievement. Their timeliness seems apparent since now "there is a somewhat general conviction that infidelity, either tame or violent, is making rapid strides in many quarters outside the Catholic Church," writes Bishop Fallon, of London, in a prefatory estimate. "And, among Catholics," he continues, "the admission is universal that, if doctrinal knowledge is to hold its own against easy ignorance, there must be constant and intelligent effort in every line of religious instruction. Judging by their titles, those who planned and executed the Treasury of Faith Series have realized this fact. Their work covers the whole field of dogmatic teaching and makes a valuable addition to English theological literature."

Priests and seminarians will find the volumes of this series of ready service. Librarians of high school and college libraries will do well to consider these as valuable supplementary reading for the courses in religion. All laymen who desire to be able to give a reason for the faith they possess will come by a simple exposition of meaty matter.

Griechische Patriarchen and Römische Päpste, by Georg Hoffman, S.J. (Institute of Oriental Studies, Rome), constitutes Volume XIII of *"Orientalia Christiana."* Two other studies dealing with Constantinople and Antioch and Jerusalem will follow shortly. This study is important and is well documented and will be found useful to students of the Oriental Church. We hope that later on it will be translated into English.

The Eastern Churches and the Papacy, by S. Herbert Scott, D.Ph., B.Litt., Rector of Oddington (Sheed & Ward, London), is reviewed at considerable length by H. J. Chapman in the *Downside Review*. It is, as far as we know, the only complete work in English regarding the conflict between Rome and Byzantium. It should be read in conjunction with Dr. Adrian Fortescue's works dealing with Eastern ecclesiasticism.

The Life of Christ. A Historical, Critical and Apologetic Exposition, translated by Rev. Newton Thompson, S.T.D., is the product of an author who was a well-known Biblical scholar and writer, and a Consultor of the Biblical Commission. A reviewer says of the work: "It is impossible not to feel under a debt of gratitude to author and translator for this magnificent work, so replete with learning on every page, so instinct with Catholic feeling and devotion. It is the product of Catholic scholarship and sound Sulpician piety, and it needs no further recommendation!"

The Struggle for Catholic Emancipation, by Denis Gwynn (Longmans Green & Co., New York), is a timely publication in view of the celebration to be held this year. It is the first complete study of the struggle for emancipation of the Catholics in England and Ireland until O'Connell's triumph in compelling the Duke of Wellington to sponsor a bill for the unconditional admission of Catholics to Parliament.

Thomas Aquinas, His Personality and Thought, by Dr. Martin Grabman, translated by Rev. Virgil Michel, Ph.D., is a valuable publication wherein is pictured the life of the Angelic Doctor, his vast labors and his success as a disputant on great questions of his time described. The book is a comprehensive presentation of Thomas Aquinas by one admirably equipped to make clear his character and ideas. It is published by Longmans Green and Company, New York.

The Life and Work of Bl. Robert Cardinal Bellarmine, S.J., by James Broderick, S.J., 2 vols. (Burnes, Oates and Washburne), is a solid publication and eminently useful to students of both history and political science.

An Outline of Europe Since 1815, by Frank Williams Prescott (Henry Holt and Company, New York), is intended to assist instructors and students in the study of European history since 1815. A considerable amount of material is provided and the map studies which are inserted will be found very suggestive.

The History of Franciscan Preachers (1209-1927), by Fr. Auscar Zawart, O.M.Cap. (Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., New York), is a valuable reprint from the Report of the Ninth Annual Meeting of the Franciscan Educational Conference. It is one of the most valuable papers contributed during the Conference and exemplifies the statement: *en bibliographie le temps amène toujours, quelque découverte nouvelle.* It is an excellent study.

Report of the Tenth Annual Meeting of the Franciscan Educational Conference, held at Hinsdale, Illinois, June 29th to July 1st, 1928. Like its predecessors in this field, the Report published by the Capuchin College, Brookland, D. C., reflects credit upon its compiler, Rev. Felix M. Kirsch, O.M., Cap., whose literary labors are too well known for further comment. We hope shortly to make an extensive analysis of the Report.

Aubanel Frères, of Avignon, have sent us an interesting study by M. Tarny, *Ce que j'ai ru à Konnerseulte—Thérèse Neumann, Stiquabesée.* The author seems to have dealt with the subject sympathetically and exhaustively.

The same firm has also forwarded us *La vie de Philip Howard,* Earl of Arundel and Surrey by M. Bastian; though interesting it adds little to the biography of "this theme of honour and renown."

Sheed & Ward, 31 Paternoster Row, E. C., London, are most progressive publishers. They have recently inaugurated a new magazine, *This Publishing Business.* It is full of valuable material and costs nothing! From them you can purchase Dr. Arendzen's *Men and Manners in the Days of Christ,* Dom Chapman's *Studies in the Early Papacy, The Eastern Churches and the Papacy,* by Dr. S. H. Scott. Dr. Scott is an Anglican scholar and his conclusions regarding the Bishop of Rome are very significant.

Religion Without God, by Fulton J. Sheen, Ph.D., S.T.D. (Longmans Green & Co., New York), answers the question which we must ask ourselves if we follow the modern attitude toward religion as it springs from the intellectual ferment produced by modern progress. *Religion Without God* gives this question an impressive answer.

Dr. Sheen, who is thoroughly familiar with both sides of the case, presents not only the complaints against the traditional idea of religion, but also the substitute idea which is that of a religion of values, thus offering a clear and unbiassed synthesis of the whole range of contemporary philosophy of religion. But on the grounds of logic alone he is forced to conclude that a religion without God Who is the Alpha and the Omega of all things is as meaningless as biology without life, mathematics without quantities, and physics without matter. His conclusion is that it is God and *not a new idea of God* the religious world needs today; that it is mankind which needs adjustment, not God.

The American Foundations of the Sisters of Notre Dame De Namur (Dolphin Press, Philadelphia), is a record of the activities of this distinguished community in America, beginning in Cincinnati in 1840. It has under its care 46,632 pupils in parochial schools, 4,865 in academies and boarding schools, with Trinity College, in Washington at the apex. The volume is splendidly made and is in every sense most attractive.

Benziger Brothers, have recently issued *The Sunday Missal,* compiled by Father Lasance, with introduction, notes, and a Book of Prayer. There are unmistakeable indications that the liturgical movement is spreading in the United States and there are signs that Father Lasance's attractive compilation will aid materially in forwarding the movement.

Dr. Weber's, *The Christian Era,* of the Catholic University Series, published by the Catholic Educational Press, Brookland, D. C., has reached its sixth

edition. This new edition has bibliographies brought up to date, and retains all the valuable features of earlier editions. The volume has become a most popular text. Having used it for a long period in history classes, the writer dares to state that it is unquestionably the most practical work of its kind with which he is familiar. It emphasizes in an unobtrusive but emphatic way the continuity of the life of the Church and gives a new understanding of her structure and work. An added feature of this valuable work rests in the fact that both in format and size it is most attractive and withal inexpensive. It will doubtless become more widely appreciated by discriminating teachers.

The Stratford Company and the *Extension Magazine* are offering a prize of $2,000 for the best Catholic novel, to be submitted on or before October 1, 1929. This contest is open to non-Catholic as well as to Catholic writers, and the novel need not be one necessarily dealing with religion. The judges in this contest are Dr. James J. Walsh, Kathleen Norris, and Mary Synon.

For further particulars, contestants may write to The Stratford Company, Publishers, 289 Congress Street, Boston, Mass.

Most Rev. Archbishop Howard announced recently the change of the title of his see from the Archdiocese of Oregon City to the Archdiocese of Portland in Oregon, in accordance with authorization received from the Holy See through the apostolic delegation in Washington, D. C.

In the papal brief designating Portland as the episcopal city of the archdiocese it is stated that the action has been taken upon the petition of Archbishop Howard and the recommendation of Archbishop Fumasoni Biondi, apostolic delegate in the United States. The change of title, it is pointed out, is conformable to the conditions which have existed for many years, the Oregon archbishops having long resided in this city.

The archdiocese dates from 1846 when Francis Norbert Blanchet, who had been named vicar apostolic of Oregon in 1843, was promoted to the archiepiscopal see of Oregon City. It is the second oldest archdiocese in the United States, that of Baltimore being the oldest. Archbishop Blanchet resided at Oregon City until 1862, when he removed his residence to Portland which had meanwhile become the metropolis of the Oregon country.

NOTES AND COMMENT

Mediaeval Popes and the Jews.—We are indebted to the *Tablet* (London) for the following:

At the meeting of the Lingard Society on Monday evening, at 22 Russell Square, Father Francis Day delivered a lecture on "The Mediaeval Popes and the Jews." The President, Professor Edgar Prestage, D.Litt., was in the Chair. Father Day said that he would ask the indulgence of his hearers while he quoted a passage from a sermon preached by a Dominican Father on the occasion of the death of Father Marie Alphonse Ratisbonne, the famous convert Jew. This passage dealt with the wonderful way in which, since A.D. 70, the Jews had preserved their separateness amongst the peoples of the world. Such a phenomenon was inexplicable to those who looked at it merely from a natural standpoint. It was a mystery to which Catholics alone fully held the clue. It meant that the Jews, once the chosen people of God, had been preserved by Divine Providence ever since their rejection of the true Messias, with, it would seem, a twofold end in view. The *lex talionis* was working itself out, but a signal mercy, it might be believed, was in store for many representatives of the race at a later date. It was the attitude of the Popes towards this mysterious people that they were about to consider.

Father Day said that the method he had followed in his paper was, in the first place, to take a number of Popes of whose connection with the matter in hand we had definite record and to examine briefly what that record was. In this way he hoped to show how a definite traditional policy had been built up and maintained. Then, leaving the chronological order, he had endeavoured to deal with certain outstanding questions which concerned, sometimes, more than one part of the period under review.

The first Pope to be considered was St. Gregory the Great, who practically created the traditions of the Mediaeval Papacy in this, as in many other respects. There appeared to be three elements in St. Gregory's policy towards the Jews. First, he was always ready to protect them according to law and the principles of justice, especially when they appealed to him on their own account. Second, he was intensely anxious for their conversion to the Catholic Faith, and encouraged this by all lawful means. But, third, he never forgot that, consistently with justice and charity to all, his first duty was to his Christian people, and this occasionally led him to take restrictive measures with regard to the Jews.

After illustrating these principles from various incidents recorded in St. Gregory's letters, and passing briefly over the reigns of Urban II, Callistus II, and Alexander III, in order to show how St. Gregory's tradition was maintained, Father Day said that perhaps the most complicated part of their subject was reached when they approached the reign of Pope Innocent III. It was not that this great Pope departed in any way from the principles of the traditional policy, but he was led, in some respects, to apply them differently in practice. There were several factors which helped to bring about this change. One was the growth of the mediaeval conception of Europe as being, with many qualifications, almost

one large Christian state in which the position of the Jews, who had rejected Christ, naturally became increasingly difficult. The rise of Mohammedanism was another element in the situation since the suspicion and hostility which it engendered almost inevitably affected the Jews, especially leading to outrages against them when the laudable fervour of the Crusades was at its height. Again, the Christian population itself was composed of more diverse and ruder elements than in St. Gregory's time, and finally the Jews, whether culpably or otherwise, brought a good deal of the trouble upon themselves. For example, many Christians were already suffering at the hands of Jewish usurers and the growing supremacy of Jews in commerce gave them, at times, a somewhat sinister power over their Christian neighbours. Also there were many evils connected with the holding of Christian slaves by Jewish masters. Again the Albigensian heresy certainly owed its origin in part to intercourse between Christians and educated Jews. Finally, without casting any reflection on the great body of the members of either religion, there seemed to be no doubt that, owing to the circumstances of that time, social intercourse between them was productive of considerable moral evil. In spite, however, of this rather dark picture, the great mass of the people of both faiths pursued their daily course with simplicity and a fair amount of mutual respect, while, especially in Italy, there were some striking literary friendships between scholars of both creeds.

The chief coercive measures of Pope Innocent with regard to the Jews were based upon the relevant decrees of the 4th Lateran Council and fell under five heads. The only one upon which it was necessary to dwell at any length was the ordinance by which Jews were compelled to wear a distinctive sign or badge. After describing the various regulations concerning this matter in some detail, the lecturer said that while the general policy of which the measure in question was a part was doubtless necessary and achieved its immediate purpose, it was allowable to regret some of its more remote results. Among these was the loss of Jewish influence in some departments where it was of real value, as, for example, medicine, and the social and cultural deterioration of the Jews themselves. At the same time Pope Innocent extended his powerful protection to the Jewish people when unjustly attacked and showed a sincere desire for their conversion, as several extracts from his letters and decrees decisively proved.

Father Day said that during the remainder of the thirteenth century but little change occurred in the practical attitude of the Popes to the Jews. Beyond mentioning one or two points of interest, he would not multiply illustrations of a consistent policy. But, as he had already said, there were some outstanding matters to which brief reference must be made. The first of these was the treatment of the Talmud by the Popes. More than one pontiff had ordered this work to be burned, but it was a mistake to think there had been no discrimination shown in the matter. On the contrary, Clement VIII allowed the publication of the Talmud under censorship, and this applied also to at least one earlier Pope. Other points mentioned were the compulsory attendance of Jews at sermons preached for their benefit, and the institution of the Ghetto at Rome and elsewhere. This came quite at the end of the period and was not unconnected with the advent of the "Reformation," which, directly and indirectly, was almost everywhere a great calamity for the Jews. The lecturer said that in

some of the so-called "repressive" measures of the Popes an underlying motive was probably the protection of the Jews themselves.

Among unequivocally beneficent measures of the Popes towards the Jews, in this later period, Father Day mentioned the exertion of Papal influence to modify the excesses of the Inquisition in their regard; the repeated protests of the Holy See against the horrible "Blood Accusation"; and the encouragement given at Rome to Hebrew study and research.

The Pious Fund of the Californias.—Mr. Joseph M. Kreidel of the New York Chapter of the Knights of Columbus recently delivered the following important address recently over Radio Station WLWL:

The seventeenth century marked the inception of a noble endeavor historically recorded as the Pious Fund of the Californias. This comprised many voluntary contributions by means of which zealous missionaries were enabled to spread the faith of Christ and to establish mission stations in Upper and Lower California.

In vain has Spanish kings, viceroys and private parties attempted to settle that territory by military force. One writer remarks that probably the Lord would not assist an undertaking in which religion held second place and whose main object was worldly gain. Franciscans and Jesuits had accompanied various expeditions but they were obliged to abandon their work when the king's officials discontinued the settlements. In the colony of San Bruno the Jesuit Fathers had instructed 400 catechumens and the natives pleaded with the messengers of the Gospel to remain with them. The Spanish officials ignored the petition because there was no material gain in evidence and the station was abandoned in 1685.

At this time there appeared Father Eusebio Francisco Kuehnor Kino, S.J., who was eager to do missionary work. While professor at the University of Ingolstadt, Bavaria, he made a vow to devote his life to the conversion of the Indians of America, if, through the intercession of St. Francis Xavier, he should recover from a mortal disease. His health was restored, he came to America and on Oct. 20, 1686, set out from Mexico to work among the Indians of that southwestern peninsula. Everywhere on his journey, he tried to awaken enthusiasm for California in the hearts of his brethren.

Father Kino, however, was not the man destined by God to establish the California Missions. This honor was reserved for the Rev. Juan Maria Salvatierra, who received permission from the Spanish authorities but had to plead long and persistently with his own religious superiors before they consented.

The Spanish Government would not give any financial aid to this pioneer cause, whereupon Father Salvatierra found it necessary to solicit donations. Together with Father Juan de Ugarte he succeeded in arousing the interest of a number of wealthy people and pious organizations in Mexico and they responded most liberally. It had been estimated that $10,000 would be required to furnish a revenue of $500 a year for one missionary in a country where nothing could be raised or obtained. The sum of $15,000 was collected from a few private individuals. Then a Confraternity of Our Lady of Sorrows in Mexico promised

$10,000 and a wealthy Mexican donor gave $20,000 for two missions. All these contributions formed the beginning of the famous Pious Fund of the Californias.

Father Salvatierra was now prepared to start for his new field of labor and he wanted his friend Father Kino to join him. Neither the religious nor the secular authorities would grant the permission. They deemed his presence at home necessary to quell a rebellion. The governor even declared that Father Kino was worth an army of soldiers by reason of the esteem he enjoyed among the savages. Accordingly Father Salvatierra, deprived of the companionship of his friend, journeyed to Lower California and with the financial aid obtained from the Pious Fund established a station under the patronage of Nuestra Senora de Loreto. The locality has been called Loreto ever since.

At first the benefactors and founders retained the capital promised to the Fund and paid an annual interest to the Jesuit Fathers. Owing to the business failure of one of the donors and the consequent loss of $10,000 of the capital, Father Salvatierra decided to invest the money in real estate or haciendas where he could raise the stock and provisions which much otherwise be bought from dealers. Hence, all donations which had been promised for the founding of seven missions were collected and invested with other bequests. The real estate purchased was known as the "Pious Fund Property or Estate." We must marvel at the generosity in those early days. By 1731 the total contributions amounted to $120,000. In 1735 properties valued at $40,000 were deeded to the Fund. In 1747 there was another contribution of $120,000 and around 1784 $400,000 were given to the Missions.

Previous to June 25, 1767, the Fund was managed and controlled by the Jesuit Fathers. On that date the world was amazed to learn that King Carlos III of Spain decreed that all Jesuits be expelled from his dominious and that all the property of the society should be seized. Why this occurred is not quite clear. History, however, shows that the Voltairian school of infidelity and vice had managed to seize the reins of government in Latin countries. The Jesuits had fought the flood of error and vice in the literary and upper classes of society and had thereby incurred the animosity of the guilty. Perhaps the politicians obtained revenge by having the Jesuits expelled.

As a result of this infamous edict the Jesuits were forced to leave their missions and the Franciscans were asked to continue the work. Not knowing what would befall them on refusing, they reluctantly accepted. Fra Junipero Serra, who became the celebrated missionary of California, was appointed superior and with eight friars he set out to work among the natives. When he arrived at Loreto a letter of the viceroy was read to him by the governor and it stated that the King of Spain was to act as trustee of the Fious Fund. This signified that the management of the temporalities was to be conducted by the soldier comisionados whom the governor had appointed after the expulsion of the Jesuits. The military officials managed and disposed of the mission-property as they liked and this had a bad effect on the natives. While the Jesuits were in charge the Indians saw that religion was supreme and its representative was independent. Now they found religion treated as a secondary matter and the missionary subject to the whims of secular officials who cared nothing for the welfare of the neophytes. The condition brought about contempt rather than

respect for the spiritual guides. The historian Bancroft remarked that under this regime the missions declined and that unless the spiritual and the temporal authorities were reunited, a few years would have sufficed to undo all that the Jesuits had accomplished.

A representative of the King with absolute powers made a tour of inpection about this time. He saw with indignation that the mission-property was hastening to destruction through extravagances, dishonesty, mismanagement and want of interest on the part of the comisionados. He also observed that because of this situation the spiritual and moral affairs were suffering. The command was therefore given that the comisionados turn over the temporalities of the missions to the missionaries. Although the Franciscans were given control of the property, they experienced many difficulties owing to the regulations which the King's representative had made in favor of the soldiers and also because of other limitations which he ordered.

It was during this period that the Dominican Fathers petitioned the King for a missionary field in New Spain. On May 12, 1772, they took charge of the older missions held by the Franciscans in Lower California, whilst the disciples of St. Francis decided to establish stations from San Diego northward to San Francisco and beyond. The glorious work accomplished by Fra Junipero Serra and his companions in seen in the many famous missions whose names and some of whose buildings still remain in our State of California.

In the month of February, 1821, August Iturbide, a colonel in the royal army, raised the flag of rebellion against Spain and in May, 1822, he had himself proclaimed Emperor of Mexico under the name of Augustin I. After a rule of ten months he was forced to abdicate and leave the country. A Mexican republic was then founded and a quasi-republican form of government was given to California with Jose Maria de Echeandia as governor of both Californias. From that time onward the missions began to decline. The new governor appointed his own officials to administer the temporalities and they took no interest either in the temporal or spiritual welfare of the natives. The mission property was absorbed partly by settlers and partly by favored individuals who obtained grants at a nominal fee. Under such conditions the Indians received no support at the missions and they wandered off to the mountains to revert to a savage mode of life. Finally the missions ceased to exist.

In September, 1836, the Mexican Government petitioned for a Bishop to look after the Spiritualities of the Californians. The rulers promised to give him an income of $6,000 from public revenues and also promised that the Pious Fund would be placed at the disposal of the new Bishop and his successors. Accordingly the Bishopric was created on Sept. 27, 1840, and the Rev. Francisco Garcia Diego was appointed to the see.

Two years later on February 8, 1842, the promise of 1836 was withdrawn and the Mexican Government reassumed the direction of the Pious Fund. A few months afterward on October 24, the diabolical intent became evident when the government incorporated the properties of the Pious Fund into the national treasury. This confiscation forms one of the saddest injustices in history. Those in power ordered the sale of the real estate and other property of the

Fund but to feign sincerity acknowledged an indebtedness of six per cent. on the total proceeds of the sale. They pledged the revenue from tobacco to pay the income corresponding to the capital of the Fund.

In 1848 our United States purchased Upper California from Mexico. Although the Fund had been established for purely spiritual purposes the Mexican Government failed to pay any part of the income to the proper recipients in the new State of California.

A mixed commission was formed in 1868 to adjust claims of citizens for or against Mexico and the United States. The Archbishop of San Francisco and the Bishops of Monterey and Grass Valley (now Sacramento diocese) presented their claim against Mexico for a portion of the income of the Fund. The American arbitrator claimed the sum of $904,700.99 in favor of the American dignitaries. This amount was the interest for twenty-one years at the rate of $43,050.99 a year—or six per cent upon one-half of the capitalized value of the Pious Fund. Owing to a difference of opinion an umpire had to be appointed. On November 11, 1875, Sir Edward Thornton, the umpire, also decided in favor of the claim. The Mexican Government then agreed to pay this sum but stated that this claim up to the year 1868 was to be considered final and future claims were inadmissible. Secretary Fish of the United States would not consent to this decision.

On January 20, 1890, Mexico made the final payment on the original claim and on August 3, 1891, William Wharton, Acting Secretary of State, presented a claim for interest which had accrued since 1869. Later Secretaries of State continued to renew the claim. The matter was finally submitted to the Tribunal of Arbitration at the Hague and it happened to be the first international controversy placed before that body. On October 14, 1902, the Tribunal decided that the Mexican Government was to pay the annuity of $43,050.99 from February 2, 1869, to February 2, 1902. Moreover, it decided that Mexico shall pay on February 2, 1903, and each following year on that date, perpetually, the same amount in money having a legal value in Mexico.

Since the date of the Hague award the government below the Rio Grande has been obliged to pay to the Catholic authorities of Upper California six per cent. of one-half of the Pious Fund Property which had been confiscated and diverted to a public treasury despite the intention of the donors and founders.

The other half of the Pious Fund Property belongs to Lower California. That country, however, is a part of Mexico and no claims dare be made for religious purposes since priests are not even permitted to say Mass or conduct any divine service, whilst churches, chapels and places of Christian burial are confiscated. As far back as 1859 a Mexican official stationed in Lower California wrote in his history: "The greater number of missions lying between Santa Catarina and San Ignacio are today (1859) veritable skeletons, some in ruins, scarcely indicated where formerly stood houses of worship and other buildings. The animals have disappeared from the fields, the native population has died, silence reigns where formerly were heard the humming of a mill, the bells of the chapels and the lowing of the herds. One of the principal causes of the decadence was without doubt the application of the Pious Funds of California to purposes other than those for which they were designed."

(Ulixes Urbano Lassepas.) In Lower California the glorious work accomplished by the Jesuits, Franciscans and Dominicans is obliterated. That territory has been robbed of the benefits of the Pious Fund by a government which has been and up to the present hour continues to be rabidly atheistic.

Unearthing a City.—Mr. B. W. Bacon says in a recent issue of the *New York Times:*

Yale University has recently been made the beneficiary of two of the most splendid concessions ever granted to the research of historian or archaeologist, and with a newly formed staff, whose leader is Professor Michael I. Rostovtzeff, it has begun excavation at both.

The larger enterprise, at Doura (Europus) on the Euphrates, continues, in coöperation with the French Académie des Inscriptions, the discoveries of Cumont on the site first reported by Professor Breasted of Chicago. Doura was a military outpost of Rome in the period of Zenobia of Palmyra. The Roman archers took the place of a Macedonian garrison in the days after the conquests of Alexander.

The smaller enterprise, in Transjordan, can already report results of extraordinary interest. The half-buried city of Gerasa, in the region known to readers of the New Testament as Decapolis, or the chain of Ten (Greek) Cities, is now under the enlightened control of the Emri Abdullah, one of the nominees of Lawrence of Arabia, and has as its director of antiquities George W. Horsfield, who works with Director J. W. Crowfoot of the British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem.

Both these English archaeologists have extended the generous invitation to American scholars to participate in restoring to the historians of today, and to the view of travelers in Palestine, the greatest and richest city of Transjordan in New Testament times.

Through the negotiation of the writer, who retired last July from the chair of New Testament Criticism and Interpretation at Yale University, the task of initiating excavation at this site, absolutely unique for the history of primitive Christianity in its transition from Graeco-Roman to Byzantine civilization, has been committed to Yale.

CHRISTIAN REMAINS UNEARTHED

For the first season's work only the Christian remains, dating from the fourth to the sixth century, have been uncovered. Still greater discoveries may be expected, carrying back the story beyond the period of Christian beginnings to the days of the Flavian emperors, when Gerasa rose to the full height of its splendor, exhibiting in the second century of our era the spectacle of a typical Graeco-Roman city and military station on Trajan's frontier against Parthian invasion.

The Yale-British expedition began its excavations on March 27. No formalities were observed, but Professor Rostovtzeff was present and J. B. Robertson,

Yale's manager in charge, took hold in vigorous coöperation with Director Crowfoot of the British school. The heat of June brought the excavations to a close for the season.

Following the excavations transportable material in the form of mosaics, vessels of bronze, glass and earthenware have been brought to Yale and will shortly be open for study in the room set aside for Byzantine and Early Christian art in the new Yale Art Museum. The large number of new inscriptions discovered, mostly Greek but a few Latin, dating from the reign of Tiberius to the abandonment of the city about 630 A. D., will be published by A. H. Jones, Fellow of All Souls, Oxford, in coöperation with Professor Rostovtzeff.

The exhibition to be made at Yale will have an unusual interest. In 375 A. D., Epiphanius was writing that "in Gerasa of Arabia in the fountain of the 'Martyrion,'" one might still witness, at the day and the hour of the miracle of Cana in Galilee, a repetition of the turning of water into wine. From the "Martyrium" in Gerasa has been brought to Yale the great lead pipe, fourteen inches in diameter and many feet in length leading from a stone switch in a corner of the "Fountain Court" of the "Martyrium," by means of which the stream of water could be diverted and wine supplied to the fountain in the centre.

LATEST REMAINS TAKEN FIRST

The Yale-British excavations began with the latest important Christian remains, the present basilica of St. Theodore the "martyr," dated by a long and important inscription (now for the first time restored in its entirety) in the year 496 A. D. This is later than the "Martyrium" of which Epiphanius speaks; but the ruins of this earlier church, still covered by a great accumulation of débris, lie immediately on the other side of the "Fountain Court."

Still further down the slope, but only a few feet away, are the ruins of the pre-Christian Nymphaem, where the same copious stream supplied water from no less than eleven superbly sculptured niches to a great basin on the colonnaded street. Thus we move backward without a break to the days when Hadrian spent here the Winter of 132-133 while engaged in the suppression of the Jewish uprising which ended with the war of Bar-Cocheba and the final destruction of Jerusalem.

A dedication inscription on an altar set up by a detachment of the imperial horse-guards from Rome, attending the Emperor on his journey, discovered just previous to the outbreak of the Great War, gives this interesting detail.

What more remains to be found in this as yet but half-resurrected city of the Graeco-Roman East we can know only as American interest awakens to seize its golden opportunity.

In Josephus's time (93-94 A. D.) Gerasa was reckoned the largest and wealthiest city of the Greek Decapolis. It lay on an inner line behind Trajan's great fortified border of the province of Arabia. It is today, except for the marks of time upon it, almost as it was when deserted long centuries ago. There is the Triumphal Arch of Trajan; there are walls and towers and churches and public buildings. At least there are remains of all of them, though their walls

are toppled over, their inscriptions broken and overgrown. All have simply awaited the day when enlightened government would permit the unlocking of the secrets of the past.

Noted Speakers and Religious Prejudice.—At the Eighth Annual Convention of National Council of Catholic Men held at Cincinnati of which Most Rev. John T. McNicholas, O.P. was the host, several noteworthy resolutions were passed and many pronouncements made regarding recent defamations of the Catholic Church. Archbishop McNicholas solemnly asserted that the Catholic Church never attempted to control the political beliefs of its members. Judge William D. Cunningham of New York, former Judge of the United States Court of Customs Appeal said that partisan politics is not in the province of the Catholic Church or of Catholic laymen as units, but that when religious principles are assailed and religious beliefs are caluminated it is the duty of Catholic men to be both vigilant and expressive, he also reviewed the fact that prominent editors, newspaper men, educators and leaders of thought, regardless of creed, class, or political faith, have expressed themselves forcefully, declaring that the conduct of the Catholic hierarchy and clergy during the last few months, has been more dignified, even though there have been great provocations for expressive rejoinder.

The speaker emphasized the importance of a vigilant Catholic laity which would function so as to present Catholic thought in a forceful manner. Catholics, he declared, should support to a greater degree the Catholic press and forum, which offer laymen means of presenting the truths of their religion in a way both inspiring and convincing.

Rev. Dr. Guilday, of the Catholic University of America, arraigned the enemies of the Catholic Church who spread lies and calumnies against her and her members. The speaker lamented the fact that despite the years of effort put forth by Catholics coöperating with and enlightening non-Catholics on the true teachings and practices of the Church, the latter, in the stress of the political campaign, allowed "their bishops and ministers to openly attack and vilify us because we are Catholics."

"We have been hurt," the speaker declared. "Not because Mr. Smith was defeated. Not because the leading Catholic citizen of the United States will not occupy the White House in Washington. It doesn't matter who was elected. We have been hurt under the guise of winning an election by a studied propaganda of as damnable, obscene and calumnious lies as have ever been broadcast in history."

It is the duty of the Catholic laymen, Senator Ransdell said to protect the Church against the onslaughts of prejudice and bigotry. "People are opposed to us," he declared, "because of the evil things they have been told about us—not for what we really believe and practice, but what they think our Church teaches and requires of us."

"A large percentage of them," he continued, "are just as sincere in their opposition to the errors of Rome, as they see them, as Paul of Tarsus was in his bitter persecution of Christians before his conversion by the direct voice of Christ Himself. I am convinced from close contact with Protestants during all

my life, that a great many of them who are bitter towards the religion of Catholics are serving God faithfully according to the lights that shine upon them. We must not fell bad towards them, but must do what we can to cause the scales of ignorance to fall from their eyes, and, emulating the example of our Divine Founder, must pray our heavenly Father to forgive them as they know not what they do."

Richard Reid of Augusta, Ga., editor of The Bulletin, organ of the Catholic Laymen's Association of Georgia, outlined to the delegates the work of the association "to bring about a friendlier feeling among Georgians, irrespective of creed," and the progress it has made in this direction.

Dr. Richard J. Purcell, associate professor of history at the Catholic University of America and associate editor of the CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW, spoke at a luncheon meeting on "Our International Affiliations," and, by way of introduction, noted the gradual development of political centralization in American polity as well as a similar tendency toward national coöperation in the Catholic Church. This unity of action, the speaker said, is seen in national fraternal societies, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the establishment of the Catholic University as the central dome of the educational structure, and the national press service which gives the diocesan papers a command of world news.

"The business of the Church," the speaker declared, "is national. Many of its problems are beyond diocesan solution, yet all of them intimately concern every diocese; the defense of parochial schools from unconstitutional legislation, the care of immigrants and Mexican refugees, foreign and domestic missions, Indian schools, and the support of religion in our insular possessions. . . . No local society, no journal, no college, no diocese, no parish, and no individual can stand alone and accomplish its best work. There can be no self-satisfied isolation."

Catholics were urged by Dr. Purcell to contemplate their new mission and to prepare themselves for a wider sphere of concerted action, asking: What can the Councils of Catholic Men and Women accomplish? Only by working through a central association, he added, can the various fraternal and special societies contribute in a large way. With this in mind, he said, the Bishops have encouraged these National councils. Through them, he pointed out, can be made international contacts with foreign Catholic organizations and various European conferences which are held from time to time.

Catholics in the United States, Dr. Purcell concluded, must not sit back. They owe it to their fellow citizens, he declared, to take a more active interest in civic affairs, and to their fellow Catholics to take both a national and an international interest in programs for national and world betterment, pointing out that there are great moral and social questions of a world-wide nature. These, he said, are not questions which will be settled today or in this generation, but that Catholics of America must have a share in their final solution.

The Calendar.—In former issues of the CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW frequent references have been made to the subject of Chronology and Calendars. It were unnecessary to repeat them here. Numerous futile attempts have been made regarding the reformation of the Gregorian Calendar. It now seems that

some definite action is to be taken; and the subject is likely to be a matter of discussion by the American Congress. *The Washington Post* says editorially (Dec. 4):

The calendar reform movement has developed to the point where it will be put before Congress in the form of a resolution requesting the President to propose an international conference for the simplification of the calendar or to accept an invitation to participate in such a conference should it be proposed by another nation. The resolution was drawn up by Representative Porter, chairman of the foreign affairs committee of the House. It is held desirable that such a conference be held in 1929, since the nearest convenient year for putting a new calendar into effect is 1933, when January 1 falls on Sunday. The interval between 1929 and 1933 would be needed to put the plan into effect.

The simplified calendar generally favored presupposes a year of 13 months, each containing 28 days, with each week starting on Sunday. Thus holidays and other dates would be invariable, on the same day of the week. All business transactions and computations would be facilitated.

There has developed of recent years an organized international effort to determine whether or not public sentiment would permit of a calendar change at this time. The present calendar, in use some 2,000 years with but minor modifications, is unscientific and defective in many respects. Everywhere, it is reported, public sentiment has been brought to realize its failures and shortcomings. Particularly in the United States and in Latin America is there demand for calendar reform. Many scientific and business organizations favor the change. The recent Pan-American conference adopted a resolution calling upon the 21 governments to appoint committees to prepare for an international conference on calendar simplification.

It would be less of a task than the average person supposes to readjust the calendar. The bill legalizing the new calendar would include an adjustment table, and would provide that dates borne by commercial instruments would be automatically changed to the new dates as determined by the adjustment table, and it would also provide for the prorating of fixed charges, such as rents, wages, &c.

Inasmuch as the present calendar is inconvenient and expensive, while a scientific calendar would promote the comfort and convenience of the entire world, it seems to be high time for the nations to shake off their inertia and prejudice, and readjust their calculation of time to suit modern needs.

A Learned Combination.—Recent advices from Rome state that His Holiness, Pope Pius XI has combined the Biblical Institute and the Oriental Institute with the Gregorian University. Henceforth they will form one University for higher ecclesiastical studies.

The following is a digest of the Holy Father's pronouncement:

In 1908, the directors of the Oregorian began an advanced class of Sacred Scripture. But the task was so great and called for so much special teaching and study, to advance the science and avoid the dangers which threatened the Faith from the rationalistic schools, that the Holy See determined to found a

special Biblical Institute under the watch and care of the Pope, so that there would be in Rome a center of advanced studies in Sacred Scripture. This Pontificial Institute was opened by Pius X, May 7, 1909.

In a similar manner, Benedict XV, seeing the pressing needs of the Church and the nations, that he might hasten the day when there would be "one fold and one shepherd," when, in particular, the Oriental peoples would return to the unity of the Church, determined on October 15, 1919, to establish a Pontificial Oriental Institute in Rome.

"After mature deliberation, We order Motu Proprio, that the Biblical Institute and the Oriental Institute be combined with the Gregorian University in such a way as to constitute one Pontifical University for ecclesiastical studies."

A particular advantage which will result is that the professors of the various departments will meet more easily and will work together more efficiently. Also with mutual help and counsel, they will be better able to write and edit articles and books.

Students making special studies can hear professors who teach the fundamental subjects, and can receive help from their advice. Those following the fundamental courses which they are preparing to teach can, in special questions, consult the most learned professor in that branch.

For the student the greatest help is a large and wisely stocked library. The three libraries will constitute one complete treasure-house for ecclesiastical teaching and related subjects. The three catalogues of the three libraries are to be at hand in each of the institutions.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here does not preclude extended notice in later issues of the REVIEW)

AULT, WARREN ORTMAN, M.A. (Oxon), Ph.D., *Court Rolls of the Abbey of Ramsey and of the Honor of Clare.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1928. Pp. lvi + 319.

FANSHAWE, JOHN E. J., *Education for Tolerance.* New York: Independent Education, 1928. Pp. 30.

GRABMANN, DR. MARTIN, *Thomas Aquinas, His Personality and Thought.* New York: Longmans, Green & Company, 1928. Pp. ix + 191.

IRVING, WILLIAM HENRY, *John Gay's London.* Cambridge: The Harvard University Press, 1928. Pp. xviii + 459.

JESSUP, PHILIP C., *American Neutrality and International Police.* Boston: World Peace Foundation, 1928. Pp. 170 + ix.

LEKEUX, P. MARTIAL, *La Sagesse du Curé.* Paris: A. Giraudon, 1928. Pp. 267.

LASANCE, FR. (editor), *The Sunday Missal.* New York: Benziger Bros. Pp. 415.

LESAGE, ROBERT, *Charles Tellier, le Père du Froid.* Paris: A. Giraudon, 1928. Pp. 197.

MACDONELL, SIR JOHN, K.C.B. (edited by R. W. Lee, D.C.L.), *Historical Trials.* New York: Oxford University Press American Branch, 1928. Pp. xiii + 234.

MEIER, J. H., *The Catholic Press Directory.* Chicago: J. H. Meier. Pp. 168.

PEARCE, HAYWOOD, JR., *Benjamin H. Hill.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1928. Pp. viii + 330.

Records of the Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia. Pp. 174.

RESCH, REV. PETER A., S.M., S.T.D., *Shower of Graces.* Chicago: John P. Daleiden, 1928. Pp. 127.

SCHEVILL, FERDINAND, *The First Century of Italian Humanism.* New York: F. S. Crofts & Company, 1928. Pp. vi + 88.

SCHEVILL, FERDINAND, *A History of Europe from the Reformation to Our Own Day.* New York: Harcourt, Brace & Company, 1928. Pp. 728.

SHEEN, FULTON J., Ph.D., S.T.D., *Religion Without God.* New York: Longmans, Green & Company, 1928. Pp. xiv + 368.

TARNY, M., *Thérèse Newmann.* Avignon: Maison Aubanel Frères, 1928. Pp. 40.

VALERSON, FR., A.F., O.C.D., Life of Mother Adelaide of St. Theresa. Oklahoma City: Prompt Publishing Company, 1928. Pp. 138.

VRIEND, DR. J., S.J., *The Blessed Virgin Mary in the Medieval Drama of England.* Purmerend: J. Muusses, 1928. Pp. xv + 160.

WIRRIES, MARY MABLE, *Mary Rose at Rose Gables.* New York: Benziger Brothers, 1928. Pp. 157.

ZAWART, ANSCAR, O.M., Cap., *The History of Franciscan Preaching* (1209-1927). New York: Joseph Wagner, Inc. Pp. v + 340.